

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 10, 1921.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Charles E. Fultz, D. D., pastor First United Brethren Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, we bless Thee for the world of human life. We pause a moment ere we approach the outstanding problems before us, imploring divine aid, so that our vision may be clear, our faith sure, and our optimism virile; in the name of Him whose we are and whom we serve. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NO QUORUM.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of no quorum present. It appears that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ashbrook	Fess	Kreider	Robinson, N. C.
Babka	Fields	Lee, Ga.	Rouse
Baer	Focht	Lesher	Rowan
Bankhead	Gallagher	Linthicum	Rowe
Bell	Gallivan	Loneragan	Rucker
Bowling	Gandy	Luce	Sanders, Ind.
Britten	Gard	McAndrews	Sanders, La.
Buchanan	Godwin, N. C.	McCulloch	Sanders, N. Y.
Caldwell	Goldfogle	McDuffie	Sanford
Campbell, Pa.	Goodwin, Ark.	McKiniry	Scully
Candler	Gould	McLane	Sears
Cantrill	Graham, Pa.	Maher	Siegel
Caraway	Greene, Vt.	Mann, S. C.	Small
Carew	Harrell	Mead	Smith, N. Y.
Carss	Harrison	Milligan	Stegall
Casey	Hastings	Moon	Stiness
Chindblom	Hays	Mooney	Strong, Kans.
Clark, Fla.	Hersman	Morin	Strong, Pa.
Classon	Hoe	Mudd	Sullivan
Coaly	Holland	Nelson, Wis.	Swope
Copley	Howard	Newton, Minn.	Taylor, Colo.
Costello	Hullings	Nicholls	Tewner
Crago	Hull, Iowa	Nolan	Vare
Currie, Mich.	Husted	O'Connell	Venable
Curry, Calif.	Jacoway	Oliver	Vestal
Dale	James, Mich.	Olney	Velk
Davey	Johnson, Ky.	Parker	Watkins
Dempsey	Johnston, N. Y.	Patterson	Weaver
Dewalt	Jones, Pa.	Pell	Welling
Donovan	Juhl	Radcliffe	Whaley
Dooling	Kahn	Rainey, Ala.	Wilson, Ill.
Doremus	Kelley, Mich.	Rainey, John W.	Winslow
Doughton	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramseyer	Wise
Ellsworth	Kettner	Randall, Calif.	Yates
Emerson	Kitchin	Reber	
Evans, Nev.	Kleczka	Riddick	
Ferris	Kraus	Riordan	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 283 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. Goob, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

House of Representatives.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: Page 43, after line 7, insert: "To pay the widow of FRED L. BLACKMON, late a Representative from the State of Alabama, \$7,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Patrick McLane, contestee, \$2,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goob: On page 43, after line 24, insert the following:

"For payment to James D. Salts for expenses incurred as contestant in the contested election case of Salts v. Major, audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 1, \$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. I offer the following further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goob: Page 43, after line 24, insert:

"For payment to GEORGE B. GRIGSBY for expenses incurred as contestant in the contested election case of James Wickersham v. Charles A. Sulzer, deceased, and George B. Grigsby, audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 3, \$2,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I presume that if we are going to allow these expenses to one, they must be allowed to all; but I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations how long this old policy is going to be pursued, and whether the country can not reasonably expect a change some time soon with regard to the paying of contested-election expenses, salary, office expenses, mileage, and so on, for a man who may not have been elected to Congress?

The policy that we have pursued is inconsistent, and every man who gets defeated and contests an election is getting pay for it. Lots of times we are paying both of them. In instances past we have paid both contestee and contestant their salaries where the contestant was seated—where they both received salaries for practically two whole years during nearly the whole session of Congress, and their mileage and their office expenses and their secretary's hire, and everything, when there really was only one office to be filled.

Mr. GOOD. I want to say to the gentleman that where a committee has discovered that there was not a real contest the amount is not certified or allowed. Take this case of Grigsby. Proof to the satisfaction of Committee on Elections No. 3 was furnished that he spent \$2,252.58.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not have the Grigsby case in mind. I was talking on the policy generally. I can cite several cases where the contestee for nearly two years, right up to the close of the session of Congress, drew his salary from the Government each month and had his secretary draw his salary, was furnished with an office and all the office fixtures, incidental expenses and his stationery allowance, was paid his mileage, and then right at the close of the Congress the contestant came in and unseated him, and he would likewise get all of these items paid to him also.

Mr. GOOD. What are you going to do? A man comes with a certificate, takes the oath, performs the duties for one or two years—does the gentleman think that man ought to render the services, believing he is a Representative, without compensation? On the other hand, the Constitution and the law guarantees to the man that finally gets a certificate compensation for the time he was elected.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; but does not the chairman believe that we ought to stop so many unreasonable contests? Many of them have come without reason in the past. And does not the gentleman believe it would be a good idea for Congress to require a man, where there is a contest and he is unseated, to return to the Government that which he received without authority of law?

Mr. GOOD. No; I do not think there is any abuse of this privilege. There are 435 Members elected to the House. It is a great honor to be a Member of this body, and that honor must be preserved. The rights of the Member and the rights of the ballot box must be preserved.

Mr. BLANTON. And yet the chairman knows of cases in years past where the contestant had no reasonable ground whatever for believing that he was going to be seated, but was contesting the case merely for what he could make out of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, at the end of the page, insert: "For payment to Henry H. Bodenstab for expenses incurred as contestant in the contested-election case of Bodenstab against Berger, audited and recommended by Committee on Elections No. 1, \$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For miscellaneous items and expenses of special and select committees, exclusive of salaries and labor, unless specifically ordered by the House of Representatives, for the following fiscal years, respectively:

For 1919, \$423.94.

For 1920, \$39,325.76.

For 1921, \$75,000.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and I do it for the purpose of calling attention to the appropriations carried under this item for investigating committees. Members of this House are accustomed to paying their bills the morning after election. We had an election yesterday and therefore it is not surprising that this morning we are presented with these bills.

But the House ought to know what we are being called upon to pay. To January 15, 1921, we paid on account of investigations by the House \$187,064.33. In addition to that, this bill covers a deficiency for the year 1920, in the contingent fund of the House, and of the total amount appropriated for this purpose the amount to be charged to the investigating committees is \$14,786, making the total appropriation to date, on account of the investigating committees of the House, \$201,850.98.

Of course, this does not begin to tell the story, for in addition to the expenses incurred by the Government in the time of the clerks in the department called upon to furnish data at different times, the printing of the hearings is costing the taxpayers an enormous sum.

The Public Printer states that it will cost \$2.50 a page for every page of the hearings of the various committees. Then when we consider the cost of franking the hearings out we can readily see that the expenditures to date have reached a considerable sum. And yet we still have unpaid obligations which no one has dared to estimate. We are now called upon to pay bills incurred in 1920. Many obligations are outstanding, and I think the duty of the investigating committees is at the very earliest possible date to bring in these accounts, in order that the House and the country may know what it has cost.

As an instance I want to call the attention of the House to an expenditure by the committee charged with the investigation of our activities over the seas—the Dawes committee, I think it will hereafter be known as. The committee that was in charge of the expenditures by Gen. Dawes overseas was composed of three excellent lawyers. Under the resolution they were not limited to any amount they might pay for counsel, but the statute provides that "hereafter no payment shall be made from the contingent fund of the Senate unless sanctioned by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate or from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives unless sanctioned by the Committee on Accounts of the House of Representatives."

I contend, gentlemen of the House, that this being the law, before any one of these committees contracted to pay a sum of any size to an employee they should have submitted it to the Committee on Accounts of this House and ascertained whether or not it would be sanctioned by the Committee on Accounts, and yet the committee charged with the investigation of activities overseas, composed of three lawyers, employed as counsel Gen. Ansell at the rate of \$20,000 per year and expenses and furnished him with a secretary without submitting the case to the Accounts Committee. I have no objection to counsel securing as much compensation as he could. That was his business. My criticism is of the judgment of the committee, not counsel. I have no doubt that he is a distinguished lawyer and a very clever gentleman. He was in the War Department and his entire compensation during that time did not exceed \$5,000 a year. He resigned, and within a few days this committee, charged with the investigation of the extravagance of Gen. Dawes overseas, proceeded to employ Gen. Ansell and contracted to pay him at the rate of \$20,000 a year and expenses and provided him with a secretary.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. This is the same attorney who while acting as attorney for the committee was a member of a law firm that got \$100,000 as a fee from Bergdoll, the escaped slacker.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not know what fee he received. I have no other information than that which was contained in the newspapers, but at the time he was representing the committee he was representing Bergdoll. How much he was getting I do not know, or whether it is true that he represented Bergdoll I do not know, but I recall the newspapers carrying the statement. I am interested only in this fact, that the Committee on Accounts of this House is charged with the duty of sanctioning the expenditures, and this investigation committee should have submitted the matter to the Committee

on Accounts, for I believe that committee would never have sanctioned the expenditure of \$20,000 a year to an attorney to carry on an investigation of this kind. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], chairman of the committee charged with the investigation of the Shipping Board, much more intricate and involving many more details and possibly demanding counsel, has spent no such amount, if he has expended anything for counsel at all. These gentlemen, charged with the investigation of expenditures overseas, a matter requiring no legal ability at all, contracted to spend \$20,000. I do not know how much has actually been paid on this account of Gen. Ansell's. I know that the House is fortunate in having as chairman of the Committee on Accounts a man who, though he has a thankless job, is endeavoring to protect the taxpayers and scrutinizes these accounts with some hope of protecting the people. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND], chairman of the Committee on Accounts, was here I would ask him how much has been spent to date. My information is that they have paid counsel about \$7,500, and that out of the amount appropriated in this bill \$8,000 or \$9,000 is for the purpose of meeting vouchers which have been held up in the Committee on Accounts because the chairman of that committee disapproved of this extravagance. I want some of the gentlemen in charge of the majority in this House to give some encouragement to the chairman of the Committee on Accounts in protecting the Treasury, to give him some support in forcing the committee charged with these expenditures to compromise with counsel, because you know and the country knows that counsel investigating expenditures of the Army overseas never was entitled to a fee of \$20,000 a year, and that it is extravagance of the worst kind. It is a reflection on this House, and I hope the majority of the House will afford some encouragement to the chairman of the Committee on Accounts and urge him not to sanction the payment of this fee.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] is present here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, it has been very evident to me that when this item was reached we would have a field day on these expenditures, and that because of the fact that neither the chairman of this committee nor the chairman of the Committee on Accounts happens to be responsible for one of these items from subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on Expenditures it would be necessary for me to discuss the matter in the House. As a matter of fact, some of these bills were not presented to the Committee on Accounts, because of the fact that the appropriation for 1920 was exhausted to within 83 cents, and it is useless to present bills against a fund when there is only 83 cents remaining to pay them. The duty was imposed on me by this House to be chairman of the subcommittee to which the gentleman referred, and the responsibility, if any, for the payment of some of the attorney's fees referred to rests upon me under authority given by the House. I have no apology to make for any of those expenditures. The gentlemen who opposed the expenditure of this approximately \$200,000 for these investigations are the ones who would want and who have wanted no investigation to be made. We might as well be fair about it and admit that at the time the campaign was being conducted there was some partisanship on both sides of this House in referring to expenditures. There always has been partisanship and there always will be partisanship, but I am not willing to take this floor and make the charge that partisanship was carried to an extreme. I happen to know very well the Members of the House on both sides who compose those committees, and in my opinion most of those gentlemen were trying to get facts to present to the American people. In the beginning you must remember that this committee was charged with the duty of investigating expenditures of approximately \$200,000,000,000. They have and will expend about \$200,000 in doing it. If any mistake has been made, the mistake has been that we did not expend three or four times that amount of money and get an absolute and complete audit, which would be of some benefit to the people of the United States in learning what ought to be done in future wars. If I had had my way—

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I can not yield until I get through with this statement. If I had had my way about it, we would have employed the leading firm of accountants in the United States, if we could have found that firm, and we would have had a thorough audit of all expenses. No audit can be had by an expenditure of \$200,000, and the result is there never will be a thorough and complete audit. The gentlemen who make

the charge know perfectly well that no Member of this House can attend to his other duties and devote all of his time to preparing these cases, and an attorney is necessary.

Gen. Ansell, to whom the gentleman from South Carolina refers—and I assume all the responsibility for hiring him under the rules of this House, because I had the authority to do it as chairman of the committee, by action of the main committee—devoted his time and he will be paid if his bills are allowed, if this item is voted, for all of his services approximately \$15,000. I can stand here and show the gentleman from South Carolina attorney after attorney hired by the Secretary of War in his different activities at \$100 a day, little country lawyers who have been picked up all over the United States and put into these positions, who by reason of their local ability or their standing in their own communities were never entitled to take charge of any legal activity of the Government. I have been sorry that I retained Gen. Ansell, because I know that retaining him and paying him \$15,000 in legal fees has cost him fifty or sixty thousand dollars, and any lawyer of his standing or of the standing of many Members of this House, who takes a position with the Government commensurate with his legal ability, if he is a lawyer of skill and ability, is going to lose money by reason of it.

I resent also the imputation made by another gentleman of this House that he was at one and the same time representing this Government and this notorious slacker, Bergdoll. As a matter of fact, Gen. Ansell's services with this committee were terminated long before he was retained by Mr. Gibboney, a very eminent lawyer of Philadelphia, to assist in the legal presentation on behalf of Bergdoll in the court-martial case in trying to secure a reversal of it. There is no reason why he could not act for the committee and act for Bergdoll.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I will ask for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. When I finish this statement in reference to Gen. Ansell. There is no reason why he could not with propriety have acted in both of those positions, but it happens that he did not do so and the insinuation is unfair. Now, I want to say while this Ansell business is being brought up—

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Wait until I finish the statement, and then I will first have to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], to whom I have promised to yield. Much of the attack that is being made upon him and will be made upon him to-day will be made by those men who have fought in every possible way to prevent any change in the rules of court-martial procedure. I want to say, without any feeling of diffidence, that the attack which will be made will be made by those men who threw every stone in our way, when they got in the path of Senator CHAMBERLAIN, of Oregon, in my path, and in the path of Representative GOULD, of New York, and Gen. Ansell, in the effort to revise the court-martial law. It was necessary to attack the revision with a club, and we did, and to secure—

Mr. BYRNS of South Carolina. I trust the gentleman is not referring to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I am not referring to the gentleman. I am referring to the gentleman whom I expect to take the floor in reference to this case, for it is evident we are going to have a field day in its discussion.

Mr. GOOD. I will state to the gentleman it is evident to me we are not going to have a field day on it. We will pass the appropriation bill to-day.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I am glad the gentleman takes that attitude. I am only resenting insinuations the gentlemen make about this matter, and if there is to be a field day I am hoping to be present. I said the charges that will be made will be made because of the fact that in order to secure reform in the court-martial law it was necessary to make attacks on the views of certain Regular Army officers. That law is changed; it is a thing of the past, and it is useless to discuss it, but if animus is shown by men who opposed us in that fight, we may be forced to discuss it. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The question I intended to ask the gentleman was more pertinent at the time I rose. The gentleman referred to the fact that these investigations were going to cost \$200,000. Now, I find from the hearings that more than \$181,000 have already been expended, and I want to ask the gentleman whether or not he was correct in his statement,

I have understood that there were numerous other bills now unpaid which have not yet been presented to the Clerk of the House for payment.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Replying to that, I can not answer in reference to other subcommittees, but there is a very small number of stenographers' bills that will come from the subcommittee of which I happen to be chairman. As a matter of fact the main committee by resolution terminated the investigation on yesterday, and the other subcommittees must report to the main committee by a week from yesterday. Their reports must be written and given to the main committee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then I understand it is the purpose of the full committee to make its report within the next week or 10 days of the total expense incurred by these different subcommittees?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The total expense should be before this House in 10 days.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman referred a moment ago to the amount of service rendered by Gen. Ansell, and stated that his subcommittee, I believe, had approved bills amounting to \$15,000 for his services.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Approximately that amount.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman for what length of time those services were rendered, or, in other words, whether or not they were approved at the rate of \$20,000 per annum.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. They were approved at the rate of \$20,000 per annum.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, the gentleman further referred to the fact that he had taken the case at a loss of some \$50,000 or \$60,000 to himself. The gentleman does not mean to say by that that Gen. Ansell abandoned all of his other law practice and devoted himself and his firm exclusively to the work in hand during the time that he performed this service for the subcommittee?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It will be a pleasure to answer the question of the gentleman, because anticipating this I put in some time in going into this. Gen. Ansell was a member of the firm of Ansell & Bailey. Gen. Ansell was retained and he devoted all of his time, with the exception of two or three cases, in which he took some part during the time that he was retained, and that time was taken when the committee was not in session.

I think he tried two cases, as I remember it—there may have been three—which did not take a great deal of time. The firm's business, conducted by Mr. Bailey, ran right along.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute to answer the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman has referred to the time that Gen. Ansell's connection with the subcommittee No. 3 ceased. What was the date of that?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It was along about last June, at the time Congress recessed, or a short time before that.

Mr. FLOOD. When did his services begin and when did they end?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I can not give the exact date, but it was approximately nine months.

Mr. FLOOD. Nine months from the 1st of June, 1920, counting backward?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Just before the subcommittee started on its investigation, and during the time we were in France he prepared the outline for the investigation.

Mr. FLOOD. The subcommittee went abroad about August 10. I want to say to the gentleman I am a member of the subcommittee, and I never was called into any meeting of the committee that had anything to do with the employment of Gen. Ansell or for fixing his compensation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Pending that, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like five minutes of that time.

Mr. GOOD. I thought the gentleman wanted one minute.

Mr. FREAR. I want five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Then I will make it 14 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would like five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Then I will make it 20 minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] asks unanimous consent to proceed for four minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. That is to be taken out of the time fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to complete my statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield for a question and not a statement.

Mr. FLOOD. I asked the question, and then proceeded to make a statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield for a question, but not an extended statement. I have only four minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. What I wanted to say was—and I do not think the gentleman will object to this part of it—I had no objection to the employment of counsel, because the full committee authorized the subcommittee to employ counsel. As to the statement that the subcommittee employed Gen. Ansell, it should be qualified by the further statement that the employment was made by the majority of the subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I can not yield for any further statement, because I have not the time. If the gentleman has any question to ask, I would be glad to answer it.

Mr. FLOOD. I rose for the purpose of finding out when this employment was made and what the rate of salary was. I have heard rumors around the House, but I have never been able to find out accurately in regard to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will absolve the gentleman from all responsibility in reference to hiring counsel. If the gentleman had had anything to say about it there would not have been any investigation.

Mr. FLOOD. That statement is not borne out by anything that occurred in the proceedings of subcommittee No. 3. I have always been in favor of the investigation. I voted for every fair investigation, and every investigation that this subcommittee had jurisdiction to take charge of, since it organized in June, 1919. I only protested against this committee reaching out and taking jurisdiction to which it was not entitled.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I refuse to yield further.

Mr. BRAND. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. A question or a statement?

Mr. BRAND. A question.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will yield for a brief question.

Mr. BRAND. Does the gentleman know when Ansell was admitted to the bar and how long he has practiced law?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I can not give the information. I can tell the gentleman that he is a lawyer—

Mr. BRAND. When was he admitted to the bar?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I do not think it makes any difference.

Mr. BRAND. The gentleman claims that he is a lawyer and that he is being paid at the rate of \$20,000 per year, and I think it is material to know. My information is he is a West Point man, and if he has practiced law at all, not over two years.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I refuse to yield further. I know he is a good lawyer. I do not think the gentleman would dispute it, except for partisan reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I suppose no one in the House has a more kindly feeling or a higher personal regard for the gentleman who has just addressed the House than I have. I am sorry—and it is so contrary to his usual course—I am sorry that he saw fit to charge those of us who made any suggestion—and Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina and I were the only ones that made any suggestion about Ansell—were opposed to the investigation. If the gentleman knows the record, he knows that it is not true in my case. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the record shows that I insisted on examination by the proper committees of this House into the expenditures of all the war activities at the time those expenditures were being made. I did everything that I could to have it done then, and I made the statement upon this floor of the facts on which I predicated my demand. But gentlemen upon that side, as well as gentlemen upon this side, said it was not wise. I am not criticizing that. There was a great deal of argument for opposing it, and the President himself thought it was not wise to have that investigation going on at the time. I did not oppose a revision of the court-martial rules. The gentleman ought to know that, if he knows anything. Of course, I absolve him of any intention whatever to reflect on me. You take a gentleman of his great

activity, naturally he can not keep up with the record of an humble Member like myself. But, Mr. Chairman, the statement that is made with reference to this attorney, Ansell, was along the line of an inquiry with reference to a newspaper report, which I understand he did not deny, that his firm did get a \$100,000 fee to aid the slacker Bergdoll. The gentleman said he employed him at the rate of \$20,000 a year, and he suggested that by doing that he did him a great injury, because he could have made \$50,000 or \$60,000 additional. I appreciate that personal sacrifice on the part of Gen. Ansell. He is an estimable gentleman, his friends say, and he must be a great lawyer, if that is true. But there are Members on this floor who, if they declined to take the oath of office on March 4—and they could not do it prior to that time—but if they declined to take the oath of office on March 4 they could make some pretty handsome fees by representing clients in cases in which the Government is a party. But they are not going to do it, because their service in this House is not based on a love of dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to say this: That no reputable lawyer in the country would take a case like the Bergdoll case, in my opinion. That is all.

Mr. WINGO. While I agree personally, that is a question for a lawyer to determine for himself, and that opens up a wide controversy that I shall not go into. But it is not fair that the gentleman should insist that we were not willing to have an investigation made. The Record shows that the investigation was opposed vociferously by gentlemen on that side, and, furthermore, the Record shows that we were in favor of an investigation. I will tell you that gentlemen ought to realize—

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. There were many people in this country just as patriotic as the gentleman from South Dakota, who were in favor of a bona fide investigation to find the grafters, if they could find them, and prosecute them, but they were opposed to the Federal Treasury being drawn upon for an investigation that appeared to be purely a muckraking scheme to get campaign material. A great many men objected to that, and then there are other men who always oppose extravagant allowances for fees to lawyers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas may have half a minute more.

Mr. WINGO. I ask for one minute more so I can yield. There is an odd minute here.

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, is that going to cut me out of my one minute? A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. I understood when the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOON] made his request to limit the time to 20 minutes he included 5 minutes for me, because I rose when he asked for 15 minutes, and I said I wanted 5 minutes, and then he amended his request and made it 20 minutes. Now, the Chair sends me word that I have only one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state according to his understanding—and he assumes that that was the understanding—that there still remains 11 minutes, in which he has agreed to recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] for 4 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] for 4 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa for 2 minutes.

Mr. WINGO. I simply wanted a minute to give the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] an opportunity to ask his question. I withdraw my request.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time be extended five minutes, and that the gentleman from Tennessee be allowed five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman extend the time a little further. It is a very interesting subject.

Mr. GOOD. But it is not important.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I think it is important.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the time be extended five minutes, and that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNES] be allowed five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a statement of facts that should be understood by Members of the House. To show you the spirit of self-sacrifice which has been followed

by some of the ablest men of this country during the war—and it relates directly to this question of engaging lawyers—I will say that the President of the United States appointed two lawyers to make an investigation of aircraft. One of those lawyers was Charles E. Hughes. Another was Meier Steinbrink, of Brooklyn. You know the ability of Mr. Hughes. You know what he could earn. Mr. Steinbrink, I am informed, charges from \$100 to \$300 a day when engaged for his work. Mr. Hughes and Mr. Steinbrink gave five months of their time exclusively to that investigation of aircraft, and never accepted a cent in payment for that service, and it ought to be placed in the Record.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I regret I can not.

Mr. IRELAND. But I would like to correct the statement the gentleman has made.

Mr. FREAR. It is a statement I have that they never accepted a cent for such compensation.

Mr. IRELAND. I have a minute here to the effect that in 1919 a voucher was paid to Mr. Steinbrink for \$3,000.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, that is the unfairness of this man, whose permission we forgot to first ask, who does not know what he is talking about. My statement is that these gentlemen, these lawyers, gave five months of their time to the investigation of aircraft at the direction of the President of the United States and never took a cent. That is a fact.

Now, when we were appointed as an investigating committee the question came up with us, Shall we investigate the Dayton proposition where an expenditure of \$50,000,000 had been made? Shall we spend money of the Government on this investigation, which would cost from \$10,000 to \$20,000, on a branch of the investigation which had previously been covered by Mr. Hughes? Then we employed Mr. Steinbrink, his assistant counsel. I asked him what compensation he wanted. He said: "I get from \$100 to \$300 a day, depending on nature of the service; but," he added, "you can pay me anything you choose." I said: "In all fairness, Mr. Steinbrink, I think \$3,000 is as much as the committee can afford to pay," and this was the amount agreed upon by our committee with Mr. Graham, and I suggested that he give to the committee what time he could afford. He gave his time to us and advised us about conditions at Dayton. He went to Dayton, he examined witnesses in New York, and gave us much valuable advice. We saved to the Government about \$10,000 by not going over the same investigations held at Dayton—by following the advice of Mr. Hughes and Mr. Steinbrink, who had thrashed over the ground. We knew nothing about it in advance and gave our time to other branches of the investigation. Mr. Steinbrink gave us the benefit of his advice and services, and we thought that that was public economy. We believed that was the thing to do. Regarding the expense of investigations, we found on the coast that 2 miles of a logging railroad up in Washington had cost the Government over \$200,000. That amount would pay all the expenses of all these five investigating committees, yet \$4,000,000 was paid for one logging railroad of 36 miles that never carried a log. This was only one of a dozen railways that in the aggregate cost \$10,000,000 that never hauled logs. This was one small item of expense investigated.

They built many miles of railroad for the purpose of carrying logs that never carried a log, as stated. Of course, that may not have any relation here, but we were investigating an expenditure of over \$1,000,000,000 for aircraft. I say this in all fairness, speaking for my own committee, we paid \$3,000 for an attorney apart from 4,000 pages of testimony taken by members of the committee, and we tried to keep up part of our work here.

Mr. Hughes and Mr. Steinbrink willingly gave their time to the Government free during the war. I want it known. Speaking of the value of legal services, when some Member is inclined to quibble, the case of Mr. Fitzgerald, who was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is in mind. He resigned from Congress because he could earn far more in private practice than he received in this House, and you know the case of Mr. Sherley, who got \$25,000 a year the moment he left this House. You know of the cases of other men who may resign to-day for the same reason; and I see a gentleman right before me on the Democratic side—a very distinguished gentleman—who received far more in the employ of the Government in a Cabinet position than he received while he was a Member of this House. You have got men here who are not receiving the amount of money that they can earn in other employments in private life; but, as my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] well says, the gentlemen here are not serving for the benefit of every dollar they can get out of the Government in the way of money. We are all contributing what we can toward the public service, and that is the only reward.

We tried to do the best we could in our own committee, as I have stated, and have no apologies to offer. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that there is no one who objects to an investigation of the expenditures by the Government, either during the war or in peace times. It was my own idea, when the special committee on war expenditures was first suggested, that that work could have been performed just as thoroughly and efficiently and much more economically by the regular Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, which was created under the rules of the House for purposes of that kind. I observe from the hearings, which are very brief, covering only two or three pages, that the sum of \$187,000 has already been expended by the various investigating committees, more than \$136,000 of which amount represents bills that have been rendered and paid up until January 15 by the committee appointed to investigate expenditures in the War Department. I regret very much that the chairman of the committee did not follow that usual particularity that he always follows in conducting the hearings, and that he did not ask the clerk to file with the committee, so that it could be printed in the hearings for the benefit of all the Members, an itemized statement showing just how that money was expended. It seems to me that the Members are entitled to information as to the particular items of such a large expenditure. I am sorry also that we have no information as to what additional expenses have been incurred in these investigations, although I realize that the Clerk of the House was probably not in a position to form an estimate in advance of the rendition of the outstanding bills or accounts.

Mr. FLOOD. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. I wish to interrupt the gentleman just long enough to make a brief statement, as this debate is about to close. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of subcommittee No. 3, has gone into the history of Gen. Ansell's employment. I want it understood that while I was on that subcommittee I was never at any meeting at which Gen. Ansell's employment was discussed or when the amount of compensation to be paid him was determined upon. I think that was a courtesy that was due to the minority member of that committee, although the other members of the committee would probably have outvoted me. I certainly should have voted against the employment of Gen. Ansell, because not only do I not regard him as a big lawyer, but I do regard him as a very indifferent lawyer. He was educated at West Point at the expense of the Government, educated as a soldier. He had been a soldier in the pay of the Government all of his life until a few weeks before he stepped out of his position as an officer of the Army of the United States to take this lucrative employment given him by subcommittee No. 3 on War Expenditures. I would have had no objection to the subcommittee employing counsel, but I did not approve and would not have approved of the employment of that particular counsel. I had no objection to any investigation this committee undertook to make that was within the province and jurisdiction conferred upon them by the House resolution or the full committee. This committee was appointed to investigate the expenditures made by the American Expeditionary Forces in France, England, Russia, and Belgium. I insisted from the very beginning that they make those investigations, but they declined to do it until my insistence was carried to the full committee, and the full committee practically instructed them to do it, and that resulted in the calling of Gen. Charles G. Dawes and other witnesses who had accurate knowledge of those expenditures. I voted for this investigation. I favored this investigation, and I have favored every step taken by this committee to develop the expenditures made by the American Expeditionary Forces while we were engaged in the Great War.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his time.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, when this matter came before the committee we did not go into the question as carefully as perhaps we should, and I think the criticism of the gentleman from Tennessee in regard to the chairman not following up the matter in detail more closely is a valid criticism. I shall attempt when the expenditure is completed to have put in the Record a complete statement showing the fees and expenditures, as we have done before as to similar expenses. I want to say that the total amount expended by the committee during the Congress is not large for investigation. It is small in comparison with the amount expended by investigating committees in other Congresses. Five investigating committees only spent \$187,000; the Committee on War Expenditures, \$137,000; the Shipping

Board, \$31,000; and the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, \$8,000.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman means that \$187,000 is all that has been expended to date.

Mr. GOOD. Yes. In former Congresses, the Democratic Congress paid out in investigations of the Money Trust alone to two lawyers \$24,500, to Samuel J. Untermyer \$15,000 and to H. P. Willis \$9,400. I do not believe in these large expenditures for attorneys' fees. I think in the main the work should be done by the members of the investigating committees, and when we conduct our investigations in that way we secure the services of great lawyers without cost. After all, whether Congress is controlled by that side of the House or this side of the House, we have indulged for years and years in this same practice of paying substantial attorney fees, and I doubt if any real criticism can be made of a committee that has investigated billions of dollars of expenditures where this comparatively small amount for investigation has been expended. It seems to me that the expenditures have been small, very much smaller than I anticipated when we passed the resolution. I do not believe there can be very much real criticism levied at the work of the committee as far as the expenditure is concerned, although they may have paid more for counsel than ought to have been paid.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; if I have the time.

Mr. BLANTON. If all of the subcommittee chairmen had pursued the policy of our distinguished statesman from Massachusetts, Mr. WALSH, we would not have had any of these enormous sums of the people's money paid out for lawyerettes.

Mr. GOOD. They were following the footsteps of previous Congresses, where they paid out \$34,400 for lawyers' fees.

Mr. BLANTON. Not in investigations of the importance of those conducted by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman from Massachusetts is an able man and a good investigator, and is setting a fine example which ought to be followed. That is the way we should make our investigations—do the investigating ourselves.

The Clerk read as follows:

To pay the widow of CHARLES F. BOOHER, late a Representative from the State of Missouri, \$7,500.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 9, insert the following: "For reimbursing the official stenographers of committees for the amounts actually and necessarily expended by them during the third session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, \$500 each, \$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee as to this item of \$300 for taking care of the Speaker's car. Is not that entirely inadequate? I would like to know if this is the usual sum.

Mr. GOOD. That is merely a deficiency amount for repairs to the car. I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Parliamentary precedents: There shall be printed and bound 2,500 copies of Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States, with reference to such cases of procedure in the United States Senate as may be useful in connection therewith, and also with reference to such laws of Congress as may relate to the House of Representatives and its membership, with a supplement thereto bringing such precedents down to date. Such compilation shall be of the typographical style, size of page, and of the style of indexing used in House document No. 576, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, known as "Parliamentary Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States," and shall be divided into volumes each approximately of the size of the said House document No. 576. The sets of volumes shall be distributed as follows: One set to each Representative, Delegate, and Senator in the Sixty-sixth Congress and one set to each Representative, Delegate, and Senator in the Sixty-seventh Congress who is not a Member of the Sixty-sixth Congress; 1 set to each committee room of the House and Senate; 10 sets to the Library of Congress; 10 sets each to the House and Senate libraries; 500 copies for distribution to the State and Territorial libraries and designated depositories as in the case of documents printed under section 54 of the act approved January 12, 1895 (28 Stat., 608), and when such precedents are prepared the Superintendent of Documents of the Government Printing Office shall notify each of the State and Territorial libraries and designated depositories that such precedents are available for distribution to them if requested within 90 days after the receipt of such notice, and any sets remaining at the end of such period shall be delivered by the superintendent of documents to the doorkeeper of the House of Representatives for disposal as provided for herein; and the residue to the folding room of the House, to be distributed by the doorkeeper, commencing with the Sixty-eighth Congress, one set to each Representative, Delegate, or Senator who has not previously received one.

The supplement shall be prepared by Clarence A. Cannon, who shall also prepare a complete index digest of the work and supervise the printing thereof without compensation. The plates used in printing the work shall be the property of the Government and shall be preserved for such future use as may be hereafter authorized. The cost of printing and binding such precedents shall be charged to the allotments for printing and binding for Congress current at the time of the performance of the work.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. As I gather from the reading of the amendment, it is not a copy of the amendment which I had understood was going to be offered. The amendment that is offered goes further than the one I have in mind. It provides for no distribution of them until the Sixty-eighth Congress. Is that true?

Mr. GOOD. No; it provides for one copy to each Member of the present Congress, one copy to each Member of the Sixty-seventh Congress who is not a Member of this Congress, and then one copy to each Senator, Delegate, and Commissioner, one copy to each Senate committee, one copy to each House committee.

Mr. WINGO. I understand that, but that is immaterial so far as the point that I have in mind is concerned. It does contain the following language:

Such compilation shall be of the typographical style, size of page, and of the style of indexing used in House Document No. 576, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, known as "Parliamentary Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States," and shall be divided into volumes, each approximately of the size of the said House Document No. 576.

Mr. GOOD. That language is all in. I will say to the gentleman that when the matter was presented to the committee it called for three copies to each Member of the House. That would exhaust the entire edition of 2,500 sets.

Mr. WINGO. I am not complaining about the number in the distribution.

Mr. GOOD. We cut it down to one copy, and then inserted language in regard to the depository libraries. There are 476 depository libraries, each of which would receive one copy under the former amendment. Some of these depository libraries simply throw the books into the wastebasket. We provide here that notice shall be given to the depository libraries, and if they request it a copy shall be sent, and if they do not request it, then within 90 days the number remaining would go to the Doorkeeper of the House, to be distributed to the new Members as they come in in succeeding Congresses.

Mr. WINGO. Those things are immaterial. It is the form of it and the size of the volume that I have in mind. I have now in my hand volume 5 of Hinds' Precedents. There is no question that Mr. Hinds deserves great credit, and I have very great respect for him, and I believe if he were here to-day—and I base this statement on statements that he made to me in conversation while living—he would want to do what was done then, follow the customary form of digests at that time. But if he were living I think he would insist that we come down to a more modern state. Here is volume 5 of Hinds' Precedents and here is another book in my hand which weighs less and is smaller, and yet has over three times as much material in it. As I understand it, the gentleman who is doing this work is the only one who can bring it down to date accurately and promptly, but this amendment leaves him no discretion. He has to have a reprint of Hinds' Precedents regardless of whether there is obsolete matter contained or not, and in addition to that he has to have this large margin and must use this heavy paper and use this large-sized book. Why not cut that out and let the gentleman under the direction of the Speaker and the present parliamentarian give us this reprint or this revised edition of Hinds' Precedents in forms that will be modern.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman going to make the point of order.

Mr. WINGO. I have reserved the point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think we ought to know whether the gentleman is going to make it.

Mr. WINGO. I am asking the gentleman from Iowa whether he would be willing to have that reprint eliminated.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is the gentleman going to make the point of order if it is not eliminated?

Mr. WINGO. Oh, that brings on more conversation, and I would not want to answer it right now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. I would say to the gentleman that the language to which he objects is language that Mr. Cannon brought to the committee and asked the committee to adopt. This does not provide that the book shall contain the same weight of paper, but it does provide that it shall be of the same size, because Mr. Cannon has figured out that he will reprint or have reprinted five volumes from the same plates. If you are not going to reprint these five volumes, then you will have to make new plates of a smaller or a larger size.

Mr. WINGO. I will ask the gentleman to wait and use his own time, for mine is limited. Here is the point that I want to make: The language of the amendment that the gentleman has offered will compel Mr. Cannon to use practically this same paper and size and everything else. I am opposed to reprinting from the old plates, including all of the obsolete matter. It is the purpose to send these out to libraries throughout the country. You are going to have 10 large volumes, like this which I hold in my hand. Why is it that these are not used any more than they are? It is because they are cumbersome. You have a lot of obsolete matter, and if Mr. Hinds were living he would cut out fully 20 per cent of the text of these old reports.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. In just a moment. Even if that be true you can print it on thinner paper and have a narrower margin and can have a smaller volume and use modern forms. You can use black-face type in a size that is sufficient and of smaller size than this, which will be more easily read even by weak eyes. You can save a lot of wasted space that will not only cost less money, but which will not take up the space for years in the libraries and in our own rooms. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. These sets probably will not be sent to all libraries, if I understand the amendment. They are useful practically only in the House. The gentleman refers to the margin on the printed page. I do not know how it is with others, but that margin in my set is very valuable to me for the purpose of making notes. No one can follow the precedents without making marginal notes in the volumes. The gentleman speaks of obsolete matter. There is no obsolete matter in the history of parliamentary law.

Mr. WINGO. There are some obsolete decisions predicated on rules that have been supplanted.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. All rules are a growth, and decisions relating to all rules are valuable. In the gentleman's reasoning he would say that Jefferson's Manual is largely obsolete.

Mr. WINGO. But here is the point which the gentleman overlooks. We still have in the Library here available the present copies of Hinds' Precedents, these old sets, but I would not destroy them. We are trying to bring down for present use the edition, so as to have this work current and up to date. That is all we are trying to do. Now, why not do that? Why say that you must have it of the same size?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is not intended to rewrite Hinds' Precedents to be brought down to date. That adds to the reason there should be plenty of margin, because you frequently make cross references on the old volumes and you put them in the new volumes if you keep up to date.

Mr. WINGO. Well, that may be true, but I do not think we ought to have the size. I think—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, a gentleman suggests that we print these on India paper. If it is done I will not read it. That would not be a loss, perhaps, but might make trouble at times.

Mr. WINGO. Not necessarily on India paper, but there is other paper of less weight and less expensive.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I want to get a plain print on good paper if I am going to read it. [Applause.]

Mr. WINGO. That is exactly what I want.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. We older men not having the bright healthy eyes which the gentleman from Arkansas has—

Mr. WINGO. I decline to yield further, that is not information to me at all. I generally get information from the gentleman. Here is the point and then I will conclude. Of course, I am not going to object, I think we ought to have it, but I do suggest that you ought not to bind it down to a particular size.

Mr. GOOD. It will cost \$25,000 more to change the size of the plates.

Mr. WINGO. What is the paltry cost of a few thousand dollars on a work like this? It takes the same place in this body that the digest of the Supreme Court reports take to a lawyer, to the ordinary practitioner. There is not a State in the Union where there is any such cumbersome digest of the decisions of the courts as in the House of Representatives. You can condense all of this text in lines that read easier for gentlemen's

eyes, and mine are not as good as they used to be, you can have a better type, better paper, a volume not so cumbersome, that will read easier and is more easily referred to.

Mr. GOOD. We have followed in this resolution the same language that was used when the second edition was authorized. The paper is altogether different and there is nothing in this resolution that specifies the kind of paper at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask a question. Do I understand the chairman of the committee to say that a sufficient number were to be printed to take care of the Members of the next Congress and the succeeding Congress?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and perhaps for 6 or 7 years; I should say 10 years.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I understood the chairman further to say that the plates were to be retained?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. So that succeeding sets of these Hinds' Precedents could be printed?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Does not the gentleman think it best at the present time only to print about a thousand sets?

Mr. GOOD. No; it takes more than that, and while on the press the work will be a great deal cheaper. It takes more than a thousand; it will take about 1,311 simply to take care of this Congress, the next Congress, the libraries, and so forth.

Mr. McCLINTIC. In other words, is it contemplated to send it to all the little libraries over the United States?

Mr. GOOD. No; just the depository libraries, as required by law. We have got to provide those, and those we do not intend to send until they are asked for.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to the amendment. I move to strike out the following language:

Such compilation shall be of the typographical style, size of page, and of the style of indexing used in House Document No. 576, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, known as "Parliamentary Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States," and shall be divided into volumes each approximately of the size of said House Document No. 576.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wingo to the amendment offered by Mr. Good: Strike out the following language:

"Such compilation shall be of the typographical style, size of page, and of the style of indexing used in House Document No. 576, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, known as 'Parliamentary Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States,' and shall be divided into volumes each approximately of the size of the said House Document No. 576."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WINGO. Now, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say, if I can have the attention of the committee, that the amendment that I offer does not affect anything except the size of page and the size of volume and typographic style. Now, remember this language I move to strike out covers something else besides size of page, it says size of volume. That precludes the gentleman who has charge of it from using a smaller volume, even if he can find thinner paper that will be a better paper—a cheaper paper, yet a better paper—than this heavy card paper.

He might be able to get a better alignment on the page, different spacing at different places, where now there is a great deal of waste. In addition to that, even if he did so, he would be compelled to use the same size of volume, of the same thickness, length, and breadth. I say to leave the latitude to the Speaker, the parliamentarian, and Mr. Cannon, so that they can exercise such judgment as they see fit in the improvement of the size, both of the page and volume and in the style that they want. With my amendment I leave them untrammelled as to that. Let them bring it down to date. I am the last man in this House that wants to destroy the monument to Mr. Hinds, but I want to make it a greater monument in its form and make-up, so that it will be more readily usable by Members of the House. That is the real purpose of my amendment. It does not destroy the work at all.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that because the amendment requires this to be printed in the same size, it would preclude them from using a different kind of paper?

Mr. WINGO. Yes. Suppose you use a paper that is one-half as thick as the kind that is now used; then it would make the volume half as thick.

Mr. WALSH. It says the same size of page.

Mr. WINGO. That is not all I move to strike out, but I include size of volume. They divide it into volumes of approximately the same size. If they wanted to do the same thing exactly, they could do it if the amendment is adopted. My idea is to leave the Speaker, the parliamentarian, and Mr. Cannon to use some judgment about it.

Mr. GOOD. There [exhibiting] is the original Hinds' Precedents, and when they provided for the printing of it they provided it should be of the same size, and of course the gentleman's interpretation of that language is not correct, because they used different type.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman's suggestion is that my amendment is not necessary, because they will not pay any attention to the restrictions my language moves to strike out. If it be true, they could do it, but it leaves them unrestricted. All I am asking is that you cut out the restriction as to size of volume, size of page, and the size of type, and everything else, and leave that to the men that it ought to be left with—the Speaker, the parliamentarian, and Mr. Cannon, men who know how the work ought to be done. Those are the men to whom it ought to be left.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman's amendment should be adopted, it would not leave to the Speaker or the parliamentary clerk or to Mr. Cannon any control whatever over the size or character of the volumes. It would leave it to the Printing Office. It is very possible that the Printing Office would follow the existing size of the volume. It is—

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield right there? The gentleman overlooked the fact that the act provides that the printing shall be "under the direction" of Mr. Cannon.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It does not provide that Mr. Cannon shall fix the size of the volume.

Mr. WINGO. What does it provide if that provision is in?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If it strikes it out it leaves it to the Printing Office.

Mr. WINGO. I am not moving to strike it out.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I understand what the gentleman is moving to strike out. What is the fact? The present volumes will be reprinted from the present plates. It would be highly desirable if the new matter could be inserted in the old volumes and have it all in one volume. It would be highly desirable, but would be very expensive, and in order to avoid that expense the amendment provides for printing the existing volumes over again from the existing plates. Now, anybody who consults Hinds' Precedents will admit, I think, that it is desirable to have all the volumes much alike, so as to go in the same place in the bookcases. The gentleman has proposed that the size of the volumes be changed, and you would have one volume of Hinds' Precedents this size and another volume perhaps half this size. I do not think that is desirable.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What would be the additional cost of printing them properly with new plates and inserting the new matter? That ought to be done.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. There would be not only additional cost, but it would require a revision, by the gentlemen in charge, of the old plates, and that would take several years' time.

Mr. WINGO. Why does the gentleman think that if my amendment is adopted they would be compelled then to have a different size of volumes?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not think they would be compelled to do so.

Mr. WINGO. Why does the gentleman think it would do it?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It would permit different size of volumes, because that is what the gentleman proposes.

Mr. WINGO. No.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, I heard the gentleman.

Mr. WINGO. I did not propose that. That is the thing I am complaining about.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman objected to the size of these volumes, if I understood his speech, and I listened to him for 15 minutes.

Mr. WINGO. I did not object to uniform size.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am glad he did not say it, then. I am trying to be fair. Maybe I am not intelligent. I listened to the gentleman, however, and got from him the best information I could.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman is intelligent, but I did not say that.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I trust the gentleman will not take my time.

Mr. WINGO. Then, I wish the gentleman would be accurate in quoting me.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am accurate. The gentleman has forgotten what he said.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman evidently misunderstood what I said.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman has frittered away my time, of course, as usual. [Laughter.]

Mr. WINGO. I rendered at least one good public service. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The best public service the gentleman has ever rendered to the House. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I think will be acceptable to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Page 44, after line 9, insert: "After March 4, 1921, those members of the Committee on Ways and Means who are Members elect of the House to the Sixty-seventh Congress, or a majority of them, until the meeting of the first session of the Sixty-seventh Congress, are authorized to employ such expert, clerical, and stenographic services, and to gather such information, through Government agents or otherwise, as to them may seem fit in the preparation of a bill or bills for the revision of the present tariff law; and they are authorized to have such printing and binding done, and to incur such other expenses as may be deemed necessary; all the expenses hereunder, except for printing and binding, not exceeding \$1,000, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on the usual vouchers approved as now provided by law."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this provision is in the same language as the provision that was adopted at the time the tariff law of 1913 was enacted. The only difference is that this does not go quite so far as the provision that was adopted at that time. No provision is made beyond the opening of the session, and the amount carried by this provision instead of being \$10,000 is only \$1,000. As a matter of fact, I think we shall not need that much. But I would say to the gentlemen of the House that the Committee on Ways and Means will necessarily sit during the vacation, and during that time we would have to have some additional clerical help. For clerical help alone I presume half of this sum will be sufficient. It may be necessary, however, for us to summon in some witnesses, and we ought to have a fund that we can use for that purpose if necessary. I have put the amount at a very low figure, and I trust there will be no objection to the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I notice a limitation is placed upon the amount that can be paid for clerical help, that it shall not go beyond \$1,000. I notice that no limitation is placed on other expenses.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, yes. A limitation is placed on all.

Mr. BLANTON. There is no chance of Gen. Ansell getting in here with a \$20,000 fee on this committee for advice, is there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. There is to be no expense of counsel.

Mr. BLANTON. I just wanted to head off any chance of his getting in on this committee.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We will have lawyers if we have any.

Mr. BLANTON. Not lawyerettes?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman withdraw his reservation?

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw it on the assurance of the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Are those people now appearing before the committee appearing as summoned witnesses?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no. They are appearing entirely on their own motion and are not paid. The committee thought it might be necessary—that after these voluntary witnesses during the vacation had been heard it might be advisable to summon other people.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. You could summon them, but you could not pay them.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is right. We might have to call other parties in for additional information, but I will say to the gentleman that I do not think it will be done. We do not expect to spend over \$500.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman from Illinois said you could not pay them if you did summon them.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. We have not authorized the subpoenaing of witnesses and there is no committee. The gentleman said this was in the same form as heretofore?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Exactly.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. My recollection is that before the Underwood tariff law was passed we provided that Mr. UNDERWOOD should have the disposition of \$10,000 for this purpose.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This is in practically the same form, but it does not go quite so far and it is not quite so extensive as that project, inasmuch as it makes no provision beyond the opening of the next session.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I see the old law does not name Mr. UNDERWOOD. I had supposed that it did. I do not know who approved the vouchers in the first instance.

Mr. GARRETT. That is substantially what was done at that time and what was done back in 1909, or very nearly the same thing.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. That is correct.

Mr. GARRETT. May I ask the gentleman if he can give us any idea as to whether the committee is likely to be ready to report something by the time the special session convenes?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The only information I can give the gentleman is that the committee will work to the extent of its ability and bring forward a bill at the earliest opportunity. It will work, and it will work hard.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct the gentleman's attention to this: It has been unofficially reported that we shall probably have an extra session in two weeks after the 4th of March, but inasmuch as several members of the minority that now serve on the Committee on Ways and Means can not be present to deliberate in these proceedings, I very much doubt the advisability of this particular amendment. In other words, there will be three or four Members that are present, serving on the Committee on Ways and Means now, that will not be present to take part in those deliberations.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I suppose the gentleman is familiar, if the gentleman will permit, with the method of framing these tariff laws?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I presume the gentleman from Oklahoma understands that no minority member will participate in this proceeding, and this amendment is offered, as I understand it, for the purpose of enabling the Republican membership of the committee to continue this work during the vacation and try to have a political bill, which is a tariff bill, prepared in order to introduce it as early as possible?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I do not yield any further. I want to say this, that it seems to me that in the preparation of a great bill of this kind it would be wise to have the counsel of the membership representing both parties, and inasmuch as several members of the minority will not be present, and it is not possible to elect members prior to the convening of the next Congress—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That has never been done. We are simply following the usual practice.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I am sure the gentleman does not want to object to this. It is an old practice, which is always followed when there is to be a new tariff bill, to permit something of this kind.

Mr. McCLINTIC. But we understand that the time intervening between this session and the extra session will be only a month.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. If this permission is not given to the majority members, the practical result will be that they may, of course, go on and sit informally without authority; but if they do not, and if they are kept from beginning work until the special session convenes, they will have to do the work after the special session convenes, and during the time while they are

doing that preliminary work the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means will not be called in for the making up of the bill. That is never done on tariff bills, so that it would simply result in that much delay, and no practical result would be obtained by forcing a postponement and refusing this courtesy.

Mr. GOOD. And it will keep Congress in session a month or six weeks longer.

Mr. GARRETT. The majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means will require so much time during which they will meet in executive session and formulate the bill, and the minority members will not be present. That will be true whether they do it in the interim between the adjournment of the regular session and the meeting of the special session, or whether they wait until the special session begins.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Is it the judgment of the gentleman from Tennessee that this amendment should be allowed?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes; I think it always is allowed as a courtesy to the majority members.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. BLANTON. I renew the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask a question. It may save some time. I understand it is admitted that this sitting of the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means is going to be of a political nature—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No.

Mr. BLANTON. And that the minority members of the committee are not going to be present, and that that has been the policy for years.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I admit that that has been the policy.

Mr. BLANTON. And that the tariff, which should affect all the citizens of the United States alike, has been made a political football by both parties for years and years. That is the case, is it not?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not care to discuss that question; and I certainly shall make no admission of that kind.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, that is the general impression here, and no one denies it, and therefore I make the point of order, that it is legislation and ought not to be on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order for a moment.

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. There are certain courtesies even between fighting armies. The boys swap tobacco between the lines—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, well, if the gentleman puts it on that basis I withdraw the reservation. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GARNER. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that he include the words "revenue law" in his amendment in order that they may consider the entire revenue situation during the sitting of the committee.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: After the words "present tariff law," in the amendment, insert the words "and internal-revenue law."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have heard the statement in the discussion here that only the Republican members of the committee are to be called in to frame the new tariff bill and that that has been the general custom. Was that custom followed in framing the recent tariff bill, which affected the farmers and which was passed through this House a little while ago?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Or were the Democrats and Republicans both called in?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Democrats and Republicans both were called in.

Mr. GOOD. That custom was followed in the framing of the Underwood tariff law.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen will suspend until the Clerk reports the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Iowa: After the words "tariff law" insert the words "and internal-revenue law."

Mr. MOORE of Virginia rose and was recognized.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that a matter of courtesy is involved here. That may be. It has also been suggested that precedent is involved. That may be. There is also a question of principle—whether the old-fashioned method of making up tariff bills is a good method. I might not venture to offer an opinion that it is not a good method, except upon very great authority. In 1912 one of the issues that divided one of the parties of this country into two great groups had reference to the tariff, and the opinion of the leader of one of those groups was that the method is exceedingly bad.

In August, 1912, Mr. Roosevelt in Chicago in a very memorable speech condemned in the most vigorous terms the method that had been pursued in preparing the general tariff bills, and made an appeal that it be discarded. He said that the method was most improper, that it was undemocratic, that it had led to great abuses, that it ought to be abandoned, and he went further and said that far more reliance ought to be placed on a tariff commission charged with the duty of collecting reliable evidence in an unprejudiced manner.

Without venturing to press upon the House any view of my own, I submit for the consideration of gentlemen on both sides the opinion I have quoted from Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is aware that after the court has heard the arguments of counsel the court usually retires to deliberate.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes; but the court does not hear the arguments of counsel in private.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We are not hearing the arguments in private; we are hearing them publicly every day.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The court does not hear a case in private nor confer in private except as a court.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. We are having hearings every day in which the gentleman from Virginia or any parties interested can appear and have a full and fair hearing.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I am one of those who believe—to use language that has been employed a good deal recently—in pitiless publicity. I think that is democratic, and I do not think anything ought to be done in secret in respect to important legislation that concerns the people of this country. What is done should be done in broad daylight.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. There are two leading schools of thought on the tariff issue—the Republican and the Democratic. The people by a majority of nearly 8,000,000 last fall decided that they wanted a Republican tariff bill. How can we have a Republican tariff bill if we call in the Democrats?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The people certainly did not decide to eliminate a portion of the House of Representatives; they did not decide that a committee should act except as a whole. If the gentleman is correct in his argument he should apply the process that he advocates now to all the activities of the House so far as the committees are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired; all time has expired. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment as amended offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay to such persons as were actually engaged in the work designated by him and in such proportion as he may deem just for assistance rendered during the Sixty-sixth Congress in compiling the list of reports to be made to Congress by public officials, compiling copy, and revising proof for the House portion of the Official Register for 1919 and 1921; preparing and indexing the statistical reports of the Clerk of the House; compiling vest pocket, telephone, and Members' directories and "Platforms of the Two Great Political Parties, 1856-1920"; preparing and indexing the Daily Calendars of Business; preparing Official Statements of Members' Voting Records; and for recording and filing statements of political committees and candidates for nomination and election to the House of Representatives pursuant to the campaign contribution laws, \$8,660.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. On line 20, page 44, after the figures "1920," strike out the language "preparing and indexing the Daily Calendars of Business."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 20, after the figures "1920," strike out the language "preparing and indexing the Daily Calendars of Business."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I have offered the amendment not for the purpose of pressing it for adoption, for it does not involve exactly the item which I wanted to discuss, but to call the attention of the House to a waste which I think is quite manifest and should be eliminated. Rule XIII, paragraph 5, of the House rules provides that calendars shall be printed daily. Under that authority the Clerk of the House prints each day not only the calendar of the House but prints an index of all the bills that have been introduced during the Congress and acted upon in any way. That is printed each and every day. For instance, we have here to-day a calendar containing 144 pages. It looks almost like a book. The calendar proper is only 40 pages, and the rest of the calendar, 104 pages, is the index. It occurs to me that this is a manifest waste, and so some time ago I wrote to the Public Printer to find out what this unnecessary printing was costing the Government.

Mr. GOOD. I want to ask the gentleman if his amendment prevails if that would stop the printing of the calendars?

Mr. BLACK. No. I offered the amendment relating to the indexing of the record in order to discuss this particular matter.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman not think that if we had the index prepared and filed once a week it would be sufficient?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I do. I wrote to the Public Printer for figures of what it would cost us to publish the index twice a month, on unanimous-consent days and when suspensions are in order. On January 22, 1921, I wrote the Public Printer as follows:

JANUARY 22, 1921.

The PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Will you please give me, at your convenience, information concerning the cost of printing, etc., of the calendars of the House of Representatives, as follows:

1. How many of the calendars are printed daily, and what is the approximate cost per copy?
2. About what percentage of new matter is inserted daily? That is to say, of the usual 125 pages or thereabout, how much represents matter different from that which was printed the day before? Of course I do not expect any exact figures on this, but only a reasonable approximation.

3. What would be the saving to the Government per day, if only the calendar proper was printed daily, and the index only on the first and third Mondays in each month?

Your attention to this inquiry will be sincerely appreciated.

Yours, very truly,

The Public Printer very promptly replied as follows:

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, February 1, 1921.

HON. EUGENE BLACK,
House of Representatives of United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLACK: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 22, requesting certain information concerning the cost of printing, etc., of the calendars of the House of Representatives, and I have the honor to advise you as follows:

There is a daily print of 734 copies at an average cost of \$0.287 each. The percentage of new matter inserted daily is 2 per cent. The saving per day if only the calendar proper were put in daily print and the index on the first and third Mondays of each month would be \$147.60.

Respectfully,

CORNELIUS FORD,
Public Printer.

It occurs to me that we might as well save this \$147.60 each day. In a month of 26 legislative days the saving would amount to nearly \$4,000, and assuming that the session of Congress would last six months, it would amount to \$24,000. I think the plan I suggest would serve the membership of the House quite sufficiently in all respects.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Why is it necessary to print over 700 copies of the calendar every day?

Mr. BLACK. Since the present majority came into control it has been the custom of the Clerk to send to the House Office Building on each legislative day, to the office of each Member, one copy.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not think that was since the majority came into control, though I am not sure; but that was either by direction of the House or after a substantial expression of opinion on the part of the House.

Mr. BLACK. During the four years that I was a Member of the House before the majority came into control, I can say from personal knowledge that it was not done, for I then received no daily copy.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not remember when it was commenced, but I remember when the matter came up in the House. Whether the House took positive action I do not know, but I was under the impression that it did in some way, providing that the calendar should be sent to each office. Of course, nine times out of ten that is a waste.

Mr. BLACK. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But it may be that the tenth time pays for the calendar.

Mr. BLACK. That is true. I am not objecting to the printing of the calendar proper each day and the sending of it to each Member, but I think this long daily index is unnecessary.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman speaks of having an index printed twice a month. No Member would retain his index, and he would not have it on the floor if he were here. Every day Members send down to the desk to get a calendar to obtain information. Without the index they could not find it. It certainly would make a great deal of difference in the convenience of Members.

Mr. BLACK. Does the gentleman from Illinois not think that once a week anyway would be often enough to print this long index?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I thought when they changed the printing of the calendar from three times a week to every day that it was a useless expense, yet I doubt whether the House will be willing to do away with it. I do not know that I would myself. We examine the calendar every day in my office.

Mr. BLACK. I have no objection to the printing of the calendar every day, but I really think that it is a waste of paper and printing to print the index. I think once a week would be often enough to print the index.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It may be.

Mr. BLACK. I obtained these figures from the Public Printer for the information of the House and the consideration of whatever committee has the matter in charge.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It occurs to me that every time a Member would send for a calendar he would also ask the page boy to bring him a copy of the index.

Mr. BLACK. That could be done.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Would it not take pretty nearly as many copies of the index as though they were printed every day.

Mr. BLACK. Oh, no. Judging from my own experience, and that is the way I can best judge, so far as I am concerned, I should think that the desire to obtain the index would be very occasional.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I think that every time a Member would send for a copy of the calendar he would ask the boy to also bring him a copy of the index, so that he could have all of the information before him.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman's experience is very different from mine. That is all I can say with reference to that.

Mr. LINTHICUM. When the gentleman sends for a copy of a bill he always asks for a copy of the report. It does not make any difference how big the report is or whether he is ever going to read it, he wants all of the information obtainable on the subject.

Mr. BLACK. It is never any trouble to get a report, and the contention that I am making is that these 100 pages of index which are sent to us daily would serve the purpose of the House if they were printed only once a week.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. While the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] needs the calendar, because he uses it every day, and possibly one or two other gentlemen, I want to ask my colleague if it is not a fact that except upon unanimous-consent day, suspension day, it is a rare thing that the membership generally sends for a calendar?

Mr. BLACK. I would not say that it is a rare thing, but, judging from my own experience, and I think the experience of most Members, the plan I have suggested would be entirely sufficient. I withdraw the amendment, which I have offered for the purpose of this discussion and which relates to another matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from Texas will be withdrawn.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 44, line 21, after the word "business," insert: "Provided, That the index of the daily calendar shall be printed only on Monday of each week."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to agree with the views expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK]. I approve of the practice of having the calendar sent to the offices of Members, and I think a great many Members do find it useful, but I believe that if we would have the index printed only once each week, a sufficient supply of calendars with the index can be kept at the desk for use upon the floor, and that that will be sufficient for all of the House, and the printing of it on each Monday in connection with the daily calendar will be sufficient for the use of the Members at their offices.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman has not the word "hereafter" in the amendment?

Mr. WALSH. No; but I would be willing to modify it.

Mr. FESS. Leave it as it is for the balance of this session.

Mr. GOOD. If the amendment is adopted it will not mean anything, because this bill will not become a law until the end of this session, so I think if we are going to do anything at all the word "hereafter" should be put in, and I move that the word "hereafter" follow the word "That."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: After the word "That" in the amendment insert the word "hereafter," so that it will read, "Provided, That hereafter," etc.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against it, or I will reserve the point of order. Bright parliamentarians here say that it was not subject to the point of order. I think it is.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois comes too late, because the amendment offered by the gentleman—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman from Texas is too early; he is too previous.

Mr. BLANTON (continuing). By the gentleman from Massachusetts that it is subject to the point of order itself and it having been permitted to be offered without the point of order being made, it makes the amendment in order under the rule frequently invoked by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GOOD. I think unquestionably the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois is legislation and it was subject to a point of order. No point of order having been made, I offered an amendment which is legislation, but is germane, and therefore it seems to me the point of order now comes too late, because it would have been necessary to have made the point of order to the original amendment offered by Mr. WALSH, which is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, there have been a good many holdings where an amendment is subject to a point of order. It can not be followed by adding matter to it which itself is subject to a point of order, and the amendment providing that the balance of this session the calendar should have an index printed only once, on Monday or once a week, is an entirely different proposition from providing that hereafter, until changed by Congress, forever the calendar shall be printed that way, and so enlarges the amendment that it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that while it is true that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts would be subject to a point of order, the amendment greatly enlarges it by having the word "hereafter" added—

Mr. WALSH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. May I suggest, in response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois, that when an amendment is enlarging something, and therefore is subject to a point of order, and an amendment is offered to an amendment which itself is subject to a point of order, I think the Chair will find that the rulings have only sustained the point of order when it can be shown that the amendment to an amendment is not germane. It makes no difference whether it enlarges or restricts it, but when its effect is that it is not germane, and thereby enlarges it, of course the amendment to the amendment is subject to the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Chair to this fact, that if now we place a construction upon an amendment of this kind, so that the Chair must always

determine whether or not an amendment enlarges an amendment, and is subject to a point of order to which no point of order was made, then by that ruling there would be scarcely any amendment to an amendment that would not be subject to a point of order, for practically every amendment that is made either enlarges or restricts the matter set forth in the original amendment. Now, here is an amendment that deals with the indexing of these records. It is true it would only apply to this year, but to say because the amendment to the amendment I have made enlarges and extends the time would, in my opinion, be a most dangerous ruling and would rise to plague the House many, many times.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the point of order I made, and the rulings sustain it, but this is a matter affecting the House, and I have no objection to the House voting upon it, so I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would have been able to base his decision under the rules on a decision of a Chairman for whose opinion the present occupant of the chair has great regard; but inasmuch as the gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not care what the House does about it. I keep track of the procedure of the House when I am here, whether it is printed in the index or not, but for Members who want calendars sent to their rooms and read them and do not want the index, which is about the only thing they look at, I am perfectly willing, but do not complain hereafter. Complaint is made now because of the expense of printing the calendar, and yet it was done at the direction of the House. The printing of more calendars and printing them oftener has added to the cost, but it was done for our convenience, and whatever is for the convenience of the Members of the House is for the best interests of the Government in the transaction of business.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts as amended.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division. The committee divided; and there were—ayes 33, noes 21. So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That this act hereafter may be referred to as the "first deficiency act, fiscal year 1921."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Gentlemen of the committee, I make the motion in order to direct your attention to some of the testimony adduced in this hearing bearing upon a custom which we are adopting more and more in this country, of appropriating money out of the Federal Treasury to match an equal amount appropriated by the States for doing work among the States.

On pages 16 and 17 of the hearings, which was testimony with reference to the expenditure of a certain fund which it is not necessary to mention, in response to a question by the chairman the chief of the department having this matter in charge said:

On that basis we have an important accounting job—

That is, the basis of expenditure—the half-and-half basis—we have an important accounting job to carry out in order to safeguard these appropriations and to safeguard the States in their spending of the appropriation.

He says:

I think we ought to have at least two traveling accountants, who would save us a great deal of misunderstanding and long-drawn-out correspondence with reference to points that the State departments of health and State treasurers do not get hold of until, as a rule, they send somebody up here to see us finally in order to enable us to get together. We do always get together when they come in and understand our plan of accounting.

This was the administration of a million-dollar fund, and the salaries of Federal employees in its administration amounted to \$84,000. The people of this country have been inclined, at least they act as though they thought, that the money gotten out of the Federal Treasury from these funds the States have to match is coming from somebody except themselves.

Now, this is the fact; and I say this not in criticism of anybody, but I think the people ought to understand it. In the first place, if they are to get money in this way, the Congress must take some time to provide for the appropriation, and the people of the country have to pay that. Then we send down to the States and get this money from the people of the States

by taxation. There is nowhere else to get it. We attach an overhead charge for its collection, and the people have to pay for that. We bring it up here and cover it into the Treasury, and the people have to pay for that. Then we send it out to the States, and the people have to pay for having it sent back to the very place where we got it. Then it is necessary, in order to have the matter properly managed, that there be a lot of additional clerks and heads of departments here, whose salary the people must pay. In this particular item of \$1,000,000 it cost at least \$100,000 for the round trip from the States to Washington and back to the States, and the States had to pay, in addition, for sending their own officers to Washington to straighten out tangles with Washington with regard to the expenditure and had their own extra bookkeeping expenses. The result of that custom is that we are building up additional governmental machinery, both here and in the States, for which the people are taxed.

I believe whenever opportunity presents itself the people of the United States should be made to know—the people of the several States—that all the money they get from the Federal Government to be expended in the States must come from the people of the States; that they must pay for its collection from themselves, pay for its transmission to Washington, its return to themselves, and that they must pay for the Federal supervision of its expenditure. And while some of these appropriations are justifiable, no doubt, as a general common-sense proposition it is absurd that the people of the country must have their money taken from them by the Federal Government, which must charge them for taking it from them, and then sent back to them by the Federal Government and charge them for sending it back to them, and then hire a whole lot of people here in Washington at the public expense to see that their own money is properly expended.

Mr. BLANTON. Will my colleague yield there?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. As a general proposition, I agree with my colleague as to a part of these funds; but he is not lodging his criticism, for instance, against the good-roads proposition and against the vocational educational proposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I was very careful in my statement and tried to separate my observations from any particular project. I am speaking generally of the custom; and I want to say this much more with regard to the people of the several States.

The difficulties in Government that come to the people of the States and that they seek to escape from by coming to the Federal Government in the economy of things are for the development of the people of the States. I used to hear when I was prosecuting attorney, and all you gentlemen have, too, that we should get this or that particular case into the Federal court, because it is more efficient. Now, the challenge of that situation to the people is not to run from responsibility, but to make our State courts as efficient as the Federal courts. It is not the right to govern that is valuable among the people; it is the necessity to govern that is valuable. God Almighty could have arranged this old world so that there would not be any difficulty at all, but there could have been no development, no progress. Difficulties, things which must be done, come and challenge people, and make the people, through struggle with them, bigger and stronger, and ready for the next difficulty. And the tendency in this country of the people of the States to put upon the Federal Government the doing of things which the people of the States are equipped to do is not good for the people of the States. The consciousness of individual and community responsibility and the spirit of a courageous, determined, self-reliance is not stimulated by such a policy. The extra tax burden resulting from such a policy is insignificant as compared with the weakening of the self-reliance and the creation of a feeling of dependence upon the Federal Government. We are building top-heavy the systems of government.

There is profound wisdom in that old, old principle that we used to call "State rights." I think we misunderstood, I think we misstated, the proposition. I do not think the right to govern is valuable, but the necessity to govern. That is the thing of inestimable value. The closer that necessity is held to the people the greater benefit will the people get from their participation in government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have three more minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Is the gentleman from Iowa in a hurry to close?

Mr. GOOD. I have no objection to the gentleman proceeding.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that his colleague may have three minutes more? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not think God Almighty put into the hearts of people the love to be free in order that a man might go along the streets and swagger, and say, "I am a free man," but He put in the hearts of the people the love to be free in order that the people might first struggle to be free and, having acquired that state, struggle with the problems of government incident to freedom.

Since I have been in Congress I have seen this shifting of responsibility from the States go on with tremendous rapidity, the shifting of the responsibility of doing those things which the people of the States are governmentally equipped to do and the putting of that responsibility upon the Federal Government. Since the formative period of government progress in government has been in that direction, which has put the opportunity to govern and the necessity to govern closer and closer to the people. I believe we are going in the wrong direction in much of this State-aid work. We not only undermine self-reliance, but we actually divert from necessary State activities the money taken by taxation to put a lot of new Federal employees on the pay roll.

The people ought to know that they are getting back no money except their own, and not all of that. Millions of it is left here in Washington to pay big salaries and little ones of Federal employees. From the standpoint of statesmanship this policy is bad, and from the standpoint of business it is foolish beyond measure.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put the amendments in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan rose.

CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, before we start on the consideration of the naval bill I think we ought to have a quorum present. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ashbrook	Bankhead	Bowling	Caldwell
Babka	Bell	Brumbaugh	Candler
Baer	Bland, Mo.	Burke	Cantrill

Caraway	Graham, Ill.	McKiniry	Sanford
Carew	Graham, Pa.	McLane	Scully
Carter	Greene, Vt.	Maher	Sells
Casey	Griffin	Mann, S. C.	Siegel
Chindblom	Hamill	Mead	Small
Clark, Fla.	Harrison	Moon	Smith, Ill.
Classon	Hastings	Mooney	Smith, N. Y.
Costello	Hersman	Morin	Snyder
Currie, Mich.	Hoey	Mudd	Steagall
Dale	Howard	Neely	Steele
Davey	Hullings	Nelson, Wis.	Stevenson
Dempsey	Hull, Iowa	Nicholls	Strong, Pa.
Dent	Husted	Nolan	Sullivan
Donovan	Jacoway	O'Connell	Taylor, Ark.
Dooling	James, Mich.	Oliver	Towner
Doughton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Olney	Vare
Drewry	Johnston, N. Y.	Overstreet	Venable
Ellsworth	Jones, Pa.	Parker	Vestal
Emerson	Kahn	Pou	Voigt
Evans, Nev.	Kennedy, Iowa	Radcliffe	Ward
Fairfield	Kinkaid	Rainey, Ala.	Watkins
Ferris	Kitchin	Rainey, John W.	Watson
Focht	Klecza	Ramseyer	Welling
French	Langley	Randall, Calif.	Wilson, Ill.
Gallagher	Lee, Ga.	Randall, Wis.	Winslow
Gallivan	Little	Reavis	Wise
Gard	Loneragan	Riordan	Wood, Ind.
Godwin, N. C.	McDuffie	Rouse	Yates
Goldfogle	McGlennan	Rowan	
Goodall	McKenzie	Rowe	
Goodwin, Ark.	McKeown	Sanders, La.	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and ninety-five Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, H. R. 15975; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to three hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent, pending his motion, that the time for general debate be limited to three hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] and one-half by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. AYRES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have at least as much general debate on this bill as we had on the Army bill. It is just as important a bill, and there were five hours given for general debate on that. I have requests on this side for four hours, and I believe we will save time by having pretty liberal general debate.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If we should agree to four hours, would that accommodate the gentleman?

Mr. AYRES. It would not; because I have done the very best I could in distributing the time here, and I am satisfied that if we can have at least five hours, two and a half on a side, we can get along much better than by undertaking to limit it to four, and I hope that agreement can be reached.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in view of what the gentleman from Kansas says, I modify my request, and ask unanimous consent that there be five hours' general debate, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to five hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] and one-half by himself.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is it the gentleman's intention to complete the general debate on the bill to-day?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That can hardly be done with five hours' general debate.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman believe the general debate can run until 6 o'clock or perhaps 6.30?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Until 6 o'clock.

Mr. MONDELL. Then the general debate will not close to-day?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, with Mr. WALSH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the Chair notify me when I have spoken 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will notify the gentleman.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a brief statement, in a consecutive way, with the understanding that later I shall be glad to answer any questions that may be in any gentleman's mind.

The estimates submitted by the Navy Department for the Naval Establishment for the coming year amount, in round numbers, to \$680,000,000. That is more than it cost to conduct all the activities of the Government, outside of the Post Office Department, when I came to Congress eight years ago. The mere statement of that fact indicates how far we have gone in the matter of making expenditures in eight years, and it also indicates the absolute necessity of retracing our steps somewhat in that regard.

This bill which has been reported by the Appropriations Committee carries an appropriation of \$395,000,000, which is a reduction below the estimates, in round numbers, of \$285,000,000. I want to take the time which I have allotted to myself to explain to the House in what way this great reduction has been effected.

The committee has proceeded upon the general theory that the world has not yet become so settled that it would be safe to reduce the potential strength of the Navy at this time. But there was a feeling in the committee that if the potential strength of the Navy were maintained unimpaired, the actual strength might be reduced without jeopardizing in any way the safety of the Nation. By potential strength I mean that reserve strength which, in case of necessity, is susceptible of being quickly converted into active strength. That principle has not been lost sight of in the consideration and preparation of this bill.

That principle led us to make no reduction in the appropriation for officers. We have appropriated for every officer who is likely to be in the Navy during the coming year, including the graduates of the Naval Academy next June. It is obvious that if we have the officers we have the skeleton of an organization which can be expanded and built up quickly in case of necessity. On the other hand, it takes a long time to make a thoroughly efficient naval officer. We take the best boys we can find and send them to the academy.

They stay there four years, and when they graduate they bear the same relation to their profession that the young graduate from the law school bears to the legal profession or the young graduate from the medical school to the medical profession. After graduation he must go on and develop in his profession the same as in any other calling. And so we felt that there should be no reduction in the number of officers.

Now as to the number of enlisted men. The committee felt that it would be safe under the circumstances to appropriate for a smaller number of enlisted men than are now authorized by law. The law provides for an enlisted force of 143,000 men in round numbers. The estimates that were submitted by the Navy Department were based on 143,000 men and 27,400 in the Marine Corps. This bill is based on 100,000 men in the Navy and 20,000 men in the Marine Corps. By reducing the appropriation from a basis of 143,000 men in the Navy and 27,400 in the Marine Corps to 100,000 in the Navy and 20,000 in the Marine Corps, a large reduction in pay, subsistence, travel, recruiting, and all that goes with it can be effected. That is one of the chief places in the bill where reductions are made.

Now, is it safe to do that? The committee considered the situation from every aspect and came to the conclusion that it could safely be done. We have a naval reserve of men who have served from four months to four years in actual warfare, who have gone into the Naval Reserve. There are approximately 100,000 to 120,000 men in that reserve. In case of need the Navy could draw on this reservoir of trained men to supplement the 100,000 Regulars to fill up all the ships and make available practically the entire Navy. Years ago that could not be done, because we did not have the reserve.

When the war ended there were 500,000 men in the Navy, and they have gradually gone out, and as they have gone out a large number of them have been enrolled in the Naval Reserve, and that is the reservoir of safety upon which the country can very well rely and makes it possible to reduce in time of peace the number of men in the Regular Navy from 143,000 to 100,000.

This policy is being pursued by practically all nations. Great Britain, with fully 50 per cent superiority of warship tonnage and strength, has approximately 100,000 to 105,000 men in her navy. To be sure, her air service is separate, and that should be taken into account. But Great Britain has had to tie up and put in reserve large numbers of ships because of the tremendous expense involved in keeping them all in full commission.

What can we do with 100,000 men? How much of a Navy can we have? We can maintain in full commission every one of our dreadnaughts, everything from the battleship *Michigan* and the *South Carolina*, 17 or 18 of them. We can keep in full commission 100 destroyers, twice as many as we had, all told, before the war. We can keep in commission 137 submarines, practically all of the submarines we have—and more than we will have actually, because some are not yet accepted because of engine defects—and with these all the necessary subsidiary craft to round out a fleet of that size.

Great Britain and other nations have reduced the active strength in the same way. We will have in actual commission a Navy equal to the active navy of Great Britain, and this seems like a reasonable strength to maintain at a time when the necessities of the Government are so great and the reduction of taxation so imperative.

Now, as to public works. The committee pursued a policy as to the public works which I believe will meet the approval of the House. We have navy yards all along the Atlantic coast and at several points on the Pacific and the Gulf. During the last three years there have been expended in improvements in the navy yards and stations on the Atlantic coast upward of \$250,000,000, and the committee took the position that it was only fair to assume that in the expenditure of that enormous sum of money for improvements and betterments on the Atlantic coast the most pressing needs have already been taken care of. So we adopted the policy of providing on the Atlantic coast only for the repair, maintenance, and upkeep of those stations and have appropriated for no projects not now under actual construction.

On the Pacific coast the situation is different. We have divided the fleet. Half our battleships and half of our destroyers in the active fleet will be in the Pacific. Last year the Committee on Naval Affairs made rather generous appropriations for betterments at San Diego, Mare Island, Bremerton, and Pearl Harbor. This bill goes even further and appropriates, if anything, even more liberally for these points. But if we are to have a great fleet in the Pacific, there must be suitable and ample yards, docks, piers, and storehouses to accommodate the Navy in those waters.

So far as repairs to ships are concerned, the committee made some reductions from the amounts asked for by the department for the repair of ships that were to be actually kept in commission, and that has been done upon the theory that manufacturing costs are bound to decline. They have already declined. Some of these estimates were made as far back as last May, others in November and December, and by the time this money is available I do not think it is an extravagant thing to say that there will be a reduction of at least 20 per cent in manufacturing costs. This has been taken into account in reducing estimates.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman allows \$90,000,000 in this bill for the carrying out the program of new construction. I estimate that with present values, as compared with last year's values, the \$90,000,000 is equal to \$110,000,000 in the current law.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman from Illinois is well informed upon manufacturing costs, and I have no doubt that his experience is the experience of business men of the country generally.

Another important item which contributed to these heavy reductions was the item for carrying forward the work of construction on the 1916 building program. It will be recalled that in 1916 the Congress authorized the construction of 157 warships of different types—submarines, destroyers, scout cruisers, battle cruisers, and battleships. During the war work was discontinued upon the larger ships. The smaller ships were all put through, however, so that of that program practically all of the destroyers are finished and more besides, which were built

out of other funds, because the necessities of the war required the small craft and not the large ones. The submarines are all done, practically so. The 10 scout cruisers, which are midway between the destroyer and the battleships, will all be finished this year. Some of the battleships will be finished this coming year, the *Maryland* and the *Colorado* being well along, and will easily be in the Navy in the course of the coming year. We have spent on the program, for 157 ships, \$538,000,000. It was supposed originally it would cost about \$600,000,000, but because of the increased manufacturing costs the last estimate made by the Navy Department is \$972,000,000. That would leave a balance, in round numbers, of about \$434,000,000, and assuming that there will be a reduction in manufacturing costs of 20 per cent, and the Government will get the benefit of whatever reduction there is, because the contracts are cost plus a fixed commission—not a percentage commission.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In a moment. If we deduct 20 per cent from the \$434,000,000, in round numbers \$90,000,000 will be taken off because of reduction in manufacturing costs. That leaves, in round figures, about \$360,000,000 to be appropriated for. The Navy Department asked for half of that this year upon the theory that the whole program should be finished in two years. The committee having this bill under consideration did not think there was special need for rushing the work, and instead of providing for completing the last ship in two years we have given \$90,000,000 in this bill upon the theory that the whole program may be finished by 1925 instead of 1923. We believe this can be done without any detriment to the country. That means a reduction of that one item from \$184,000,000 to \$90,000,000.

I have outlined the manner in which these economies have been effected, and as a result the bill stands at approximately \$395,000,000. I yield now to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE].

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman whether the 157 ships upon which \$530,000,000 has been spent, and which will require some \$430,000,000 yet to be applied, is the program known as the first 3-year building program?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is correct; the 1916 building program. There is nothing in this bill for ships that have not been authorized as far back as five years ago.

Mr. EAGLE. Therefore, the second 3-year building program, which during the latter part of the war the Congress adopted, is not appropriated for in this bill?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That really never did become a law. The House passed the bill for a second 3-year program, but it was one of those bills that failed of passage in the Senate, and the next time it was not included in the naval bill.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. What is the present enlisted strength of the Navy?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The last figures which the committee has, as of about the 1st of January, showed 135,000 men.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. In view of the fact that you are reducing the enlisted strength to 100,000 men, where are you going to get the men to take care of these new vessels you are planning to finish during the next year?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In the Navy it is very largely a question, when you get a new weapon, of putting out an old weapon. We still have in the Pacific, away off in the far Orient, for instance, some of Admiral Dewey's ships yet in commission. The *Olympia* has on board of her six or seven hundred men at the present time. She has really no military value, no fighting strength as it is spoken of in these days, and when these new scout cruisers come through that old ship and others like her will go out of commission entirely and the crews will be put on the new ships.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. But yet it is proposed to reduce the enlisted strength by 35,000 men.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There is another reason for that. At the present time there are, as I stated, 135,000 men in the Navy, and something in the neighborhood of 80,000 of these—twenty-eight to thirty thousand—are boys in the training schools, and they are not at the present moment effective seamen. Between now and the 1st of July those boys will all have had an opportunity to obtain at least six months' training, and whatever men the Navy has on the 1st of July will be all trained men, men of at least six months' training. One hundred thousand men all trained, effective, and efficient, and ready for the sea are just as good as 90,000 trained with 80,000 in training schools, which is about the present situation.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. If the term of enlistment of these 35,000 men it is proposed to place outside of the service has not expired—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, we have taken all of that into consideration. We are not asking anybody to leave the Navy until their enlistment has expired. The Navy Department itself has said that, under the normal and ordinary processes, if we did not enlist any new men—simply reenlisted those whose terms expire and who want to come back—the Navy would decline of its own motion to something like 114,000 or 115,000 men by the 1st of July. In addition, they said that under the stress of recruiting during the last few months the recruiting officers became a little overzealous and took into the Navy a large number of boys who were too young and whom the Navy Department would like to excuse, and the boys themselves would like to go.

And so it will happen that with the ordinary processes in the Navy by the 1st of July the number will undoubtedly decline to perhaps 110,000 men.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did I understand my good friend to suggest that more or less obsolete ships like the *Olympia* and others in Asia would be put in reserve and substituted by battleships and battle cruisers?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, no. The gentleman knows we have 10 scout cruisers under construction. The *Olympia* is a cruiser. The department would not probably send a first-line battleship to do minor duties over there, but we could send new scout cruisers and put those ships of absolutely no military value at all out of commission.

Mr. BRITTEN. Would substitute the same kind of a ship over there?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They cost as much to run them as though they were of some account. The old *Olympia* and others of that type were built in 1896, and of course they will be put in the scrap heap. They ought not to be even kept in repair, because they are absolutely worthless for military purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. In time of peace is not an old scout cruiser about as valuable for scouting purposes as a new one, except the old ones may be a little slower?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There are several disadvantages, of course. Because of new devices, fire control, and all that sort of thing that are found on new ships, if you should train a boy on the *Olympia* and put him on one of these new scout cruisers, why he would be lost, he would not know what to do with the new machinery. Besides, those old ships are coal burners and the expense of getting coal to them is enormous. They are slow, they are constantly getting out of repair. The older the ship, like everything else, the more repairs you have to make. It is like everything else when it gets old.

Mr. BARKLEY. What becomes of these old ships when finally discarded? What is the custom of the Navy?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I should think they would have to be scrapped. They can be used as targets, like the *Indiana*.

Mr. POUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will.

Mr. POUL. I want to ask the gentleman this question: When the three-year program is completed how will the American Navy rank in comparison with the other navies of the world? I have seen a lot in print about that.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. By own opinion is based upon what professional men in the Navy have stated, that when this 1916 program is finished, if Great Britain in the meantime does not add anything new, and she does not seem to be about to do so, our Navy will be the equivalent of any Navy in the world in fighting power. [Applause.] And you know, if you will just permit me to digress a little bit, that when that time comes it will be the golden hour for the reduction of armament in the world. [Applause.] We can not get it before. There is no such thing as abandonment of armament. It never will happen. But it seems as though there ought to be sense enough among the statesmanship of the earth to bring about a reduction of armament. That reduction, of course, will be of old craft. It will come off the bottom of the navies of the world, and when this program is finished America, in my judgment, will be ready to make a proposition to the world that we will scrap as large a percentage of our Navy as the other nations are willing to scrap of theirs.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will.

Mr. LANHAM. My question is a little more specific, but I think quite important. I notice at the top of page 5, in connection with aviation in the Navy, there is a lump-sum appro-

priation, as stated in the bill, of about \$4,500,000 to take care of maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft factory, helium plants, air stations, and so forth. I infer from the hearings and statements therein that it was in the contemplation of the committee that the sum of \$400,000 would be used in the operation of the helium plants. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will discuss that. The helium situation is in a rather uncertain state. We have two plants, as I recall, one at Fort Worth and one at Petrolia, and a gas main from Petrolia to Fort Worth to bring the gas down there. We never have made any helium in quantities at either place, as I understand—

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield there just for a moment? Is not the fact this: That originally there were three plants, experimental altogether, and that they determined by the experimentation that the project was feasible and that at the new plants, which are just about ready to operate, there has been no effort to extract helium—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. My understanding is that it is all in an experimental state, and that probably the Government will never go ahead and manufacture this gas in quantities and store it. That is not apparently the proposition upon which the Government is working. The proposition upon which the Government is working is to try to be able to develop this gas in a large way, understand how to do it, and go out and get control of fields where they know it exists and in case of need be able to manufacture helium quickly and in a large way. But to manufacture the gas and keep it in tanks or other containers until it might be needed in the future, I do not think that is really in the contemplation of the Navy.

It is an experimental proposition, pure and simple. We did allow that item to stand. Of course, the lump sum can be spent as the Navy Department desires. But in making up the total we did not deduct the amount that would be necessary to continue the experimentation at Fort Worth for about five months.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman what he individually thinks, and what the committee individually thinks, about the prospect of flying machines putting these battleships out of commission?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. About all that can be said, of course, is that it may happen. It has not happened yet. All these things work out slowly. Nobody can see what is going to happen in the air. It looks like quite a probable thing. There is not any doubt about that. And America would be very foolish not to develop the air. But so far the air is only an additional weapon, and has not displaced anything. In fact, no weapon of warfare ever seems to displace any other weapon. It just makes one more. When we got the submarine we thought we had everything else put out of business; but not so. We just have the submarine besides. When we got the destroyer, with torpedo range constantly increasing, it was then asserted that the battleship days were over. But there is always some sort of protection which genius will find to stop the weapon that we think is going to do the damage. I was impressed with this idea—I have been down at Indianhead many times, and they have a place down there where they test out armor plate and shells. The test for the shell is to be able to go through the best armor plate that is made, and the test for the armor plate is to stop the best shell that is made. So, you see, you always get something to head the other thing off.

Now, as to the air, over in Europe you had two forces in the air, the Allies and the Germans, but underneath those men in the air and those machines there were some 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 men, the infantry and the cavalry, and the fact that the fighting was going on in the air did not seem to eliminate any fighting on the ground. To be sure they dropped bombs on columns of men, upon buildings, and upon roads to break up communications, but they did not supplant the force upon which the world relied to win the struggle, and that was the man power on the ground. But they could not have gotten along at all if they had not had the intelligence from the air which these boys up there furnished to the men on the ground. So we had to have the air service. And the same thing is true on the water. Some time they may be able to destroy a battleship. Well, if they came from a far distance, they would have to bring a base along with them; they would have to have some great ship of some kind as a carrier. But if an airplane can destroy a battleship, some other airplane might destroy the carrier, and leave these aircraft two or three thousand miles away from home without any place to alight after

their gasoline was all gone. So there are a good many sides to that, and we will have to develop the air, and in the meantime not give up the sure weapons.

This bill carries something like \$23,000,000 as it stands for the Air Service, for officers, men, and for repair and maintenance of the establishment that is now in existence, and there will be added to that whatever the Naval Committee and the House decides as to new construction which should be provided for.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman a question there if it will not divert him from his line of thought. Have there been any real steps taken to consolidate the different air services?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Not in this country. In Great Britain the air is one service. In America we have the service in the Navy, the service in the Army, the service in the Marine Corps, the service in the Post Office Department, and possibly some place else. And I rather sympathize with the gentleman's suggestion that it is really worth while looking into in order to see whether they should not be consolidated.

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman will yield, in 1918, when the members of the Naval Committee were abroad in England—and that was before the armistice was signed—the Air Service was under the control of the Army, and consolidated. I talked personally with a number of Army officers at the aviation fields, and every single one of them disapproved of the united service.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It may not be that the Air Service ought to be consolidated. That is a matter that ought to be taken up and inquired into with considerable care. Offhand, one would think it ought to be consolidated.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I understand that the consolidation of this service is up in the air?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is exactly so; yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The question of whether or not it should be consolidated is not for the Appropriations Committee but for the legislative committee of the House?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Absolutely.

Mr. OSBORNE. I would like the opinion of the gentleman upon this point: If we reduce the personnel of the Navy to 100,000 men and make the increase such as we are undertaking, does that give us a sufficient number to prevent the ships from deteriorating for lack of being manned?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It provides, as I said, for the keeping in full commission of all these first-line ships and half of the destroyers. Then it provides for a complement on the rest of the new destroyers of 60 men, instead of 100, and on the older craft, which may or may not have much military value, but which no one has authority at this time to scrap, we have provided for enough men simply to act as caretakers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Michigan what, if he cares to answer, was the manner in which this bill was prepared?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What do you mean?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand it was prepared by a subcommittee consisting of five members.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think I see the drift of the gentleman's question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A committee of five members framed the bill?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. A subcommittee of five members framed the bill; yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What did the other members of the committee have to say about this bill?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that it would not be profitable to take up the time of the House now in discussing the rules of the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it a fact that the other 30 members of this committee had not anything more to do with this bill than any other 30 Members of the House?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. All I desire to do at this time is to explain the provisions of the bill, which has been prepared under the rules of the House. If the gentleman wants to have the rules of the House changed, some day when we are not busy and Congress has more time the matter can be taken up and considered anew from the beginning, and then I will be glad to answer any questions which the gentleman may care to ask with reference to the manner in which this bill was prepared.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the gentleman is as competent to speak as the other members framing the bill.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; I yield.

Mr. UPSHAW. As a result of the constantly multiplying devices of destruction to which the gentleman has been referring, does he not believe that it is the duty of this Nation, a

Nation supposedly of Christian civilization like America, to lead the other nations as speedily as possible toward the great divine event of international disarmament?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; I think we ought to lead; but while we are leading I do not think we ought to expose ourselves unduly. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has used 44 minutes. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] is recognized.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the Naval Affairs Committee only a short time, but during that time I have had a chance to make some observations and some comparisons. In view of the fact that I am soon to retire from this committee and from Congress, and in view of the further fact that I am for keeping intact the first line of defense of this Nation until an agreement to disarm on the part of the principal nations has been reached, I intend at this time to speak of some of these observations. In doing so it will to a certain extent show the attitude of the two great political parties toward the Navy and naval preparedness. I do not intend to go back to the period prior to the Civil War.

At the close of the Civil War in April, 1865, there was on the high seas and great western rivers the largest and most powerful Navy known to history. There were hundreds of vessels of all sizes, rigs, and means of propulsion. Some of these vessels were armored, but by far the larger number were wooden vessels. Many were full-rigged sailing vessels, with practically only auxiliary steam power, while a few only were fast under steam. There were the monitors, armed with 15-inch guns, at that time considered the largest and probably the most powerful weapon of the day afloat. There was the only broadside ironclad the Navy ever built, this being built in the shape of the *New Ironsides*, which was burned in 1866, the next year, at her wharf. Among the vessels there were great numbers of gunboats—side-wheeled double enders—for river use.

At the same time there were on the stocks in many navy yards and private shipyards a great number of war vessels in partial completion. At the New York Navy Yard, at Kittery, and at Charlestown (Boston) were hulls of vessels being completed. Some of the vessels were finally sold for the metal that was in them and removed.

Immediately upon the termination of hostilities in 1865 virtually all of the great Navy of this country was put out of commission. It came about that the greater part of the Regular Navy was soon laid up at the navy yards, while a few of the unfinished ships were completed and made short cruises. Most of the monitors were laid up; many were sold and broken up, only a few being kept in commission. Even the navy yards themselves went to pieces, as did the ships, though in some of them there had been built solid stone dry docks, which at this time were the admiration of civil engineers.

I am sorry to say it, but nevertheless it is true, the same sentiment exists to-day, both in and out of Congress, to again in like manner scrap the Navy. Strange to relate, the same political party is in power as was in power at the close of the Civil War. There were at that time—that is, the close of the Civil War—a few friends of the Navy in Congress, but their efforts to maintain the Navy were in vain.

Very little was done for the next 15 years, except to build a few valueless ships. They may be called valueless because they were mostly armed with smoothbore guns, no better than those used in 1861. The ships were full-rigged sailing vessels, built of wood and of very moderate speed. These vessels were no match for the faster and more powerful cruisers which Great Britain had just begun to turn out.

During the administrations of Presidents Johnson, Grant, and Hayes the Navy had fallen into a deplorable condition, until in 1881 steps were taken to put some life into it. Under President Garfield, Secretary William H. Hunt appointed the first commission to prepare plans for new ships. Conditions were such that Navy men grieved over the decadency of their glorious service and felt ashamed of its condition. Secretary Hunt did not live to see his plans perfected, being sent to Russia as our ambassador in 1882, and died there. His successor, Secretary Chandler, continued Mr. Hunt's work, and had plans for four ships prepared—the *Atlanta*, *Boston*, *Chicago*, and *Dolphin*, the first iron ships of our Navy—but, with Secretary Whitney in the first Cleveland administration, there began really the first work in building a new and great Navy. Secretary Whitney had a conception of rebuilding the American Navy and making it worthy of this country.

Of Mr. Whitney it may well be said that he deserves to be called "the father of the new American Navy." All vessels authorized prior to March 4, 1885, were insignificant as com-

pared with those authorized under the administration of Secretary Whitney. In 1886, during the first session of Congress under his administration of the Navy Department, there were authorized six armored vessels, an additional protected cruiser, the Navy's first torpedo boat, and the famous dynamite gun cruiser, *Vesuvius*, giving a total displacement of 36,475 tons. In 1887 the next Congress carried on the good work, authorizing the construction of vessels of various types, amounting in all to 19,987 tons. In 1888 the vessels authorized had a total displacement of 27,436 tons. This included the armored cruiser *New York*, the first of her type. In 1889, the last Congress of the first Cleveland administration, there were authorized 5,325 tons. It will be seen that while prior to the Cleveland administration there were 22,000 tons displacement of new vessels authorized for the new Navy, under Secretary Whitney 89,213 tons were authorized, or four times as much, and I call attention to the fact that it was mainly these vessels that constituted the fleet that fought the Spanish-American War. The *New York*, which was Sampson's flagship, and the *Olympia*, which was Dewey's flagship, were both authorized in the third year of Secretary Whitney's administration—1888.

It may be just a happen-so matter that when the Republican Party comes into power the Navy almost immediately begins to decrease as to size and efficiency, and when the Democratic Party comes into power it begins to build up and become a real first line of defense of the Nation. At least that has been the record up to date. It begins to look as though that record will be continued. I have but little complaint to offer to the present bill, although I must say it has been carved to the very bone, and I dare say before it is passed it will be carved more, if it is possible to do so.

The Navy had been so neglected under the administrations of McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft that when the present administration came into power in 1913 it found the Navy short of officers, short of men, short of fighting craft, short of aircraft, short of munitions, with an unworkable organization. Our lack of a well-balanced and adequate Navy was referred to by Senator Lodge in an address in the Senate in 1916. In referring to the three-year building program offered by Secretary Daniels, he said:

I have already said, when I began to speak, that this bill went some distance in remedying the haphazard, ill-balanced, often stingy, and ill-proportioned recommendations of Congress, made by committees and compromises, and all that, without any system.

Under this system, or lack of system, the Republican administrations had allowed the Navy to drop, prior to 1911, from second to third, if not fourth, place. The official recommendations to Congress to put an end to the "haphazard" policy with reference to naval increase was contained in President Wilson's message to Congress in 1915, when he urged the adoption of a well-considered and well-proportioned "continuing program" for the construction of new ships.

I understand as far back as 1903 the General Board had recommended a "continuing program" that would have given us 48 battleships and other craft in proportion by 1919, but it was pigeonholed in the Navy Department and never saw the light until summarized in the report of the board in November, 1914, and printed as an appendix to the report of Secretary Daniels. Congressmen BUTLER and ROBERTS, ranking Republican members of the Naval Affairs Committee, I am informed, stated at a meeting of the committee that though they had been on the committee from 15 to 18 years they had never seen that report of the General Board until it had been printed by Secretary of the Navy Daniels. Though this "continuing program" was urged by the General Board it was never seriously considered. In the very year it was presented—1903—the then Secretary of the Navy recommended only one battleship, and no Secretary or Congress seemed to appreciate the importance of a continuing program of construction until the Wilson administration urged its adoption. In 1916 Congress made it a part of its legislative program. The program means more than simply an increase of fighting units and an increase of naval strength. It means the abandonment of the haphazard policy of the former administrations, and adopts a plan that will insure to this country a well-proportioned Navy, strong enough and big enough to meet the requirements of our great country.

In material and in personnel the preceding administrations had permitted the Navy to pass into conditions which may well be termed "decadence." Under the Wilson administration there was adopted for the first time a continuing policy for the accumulation of reserve ammunition and other necessary adjuncts for a Navy strong enough and ready to maintain the rights of the Republic. In the Sixty-fourth Congress an appropriation of \$3,900,000 was made for aeronautics, continuing what was then considered the wise policy of the Sixty-third Congress which had made the first specific appropriation of \$1,000,000

for aeronautics. This appropriation by the Sixty-third Congress permitted the development of aeronautics so that in 1916 an aviation ship was in the fleet and the Aviation Corps had been increased to 18 machines with 160 officers and men, as compared with 4 machines and 4 officers in March, 1913. The Sixty-fourth Congress, by reason of the larger appropriation given, insured the beginning of the expansion and foundation upon which there could be built a larger aviation force in war.

Under this administration the construction of new craft has been prosecuted more vigorously than in former years. It had required seven years to complete the *Virginia*, launched in 1906; nearly five years was taken to construct the *South Carolina*, launched in 1909; but at a period when it was more difficult to secure material and labor than ever before in the history of the country, the *Pennsylvania*, completed in 1913, was finished in three years and three months, and the *Arizona* in about the same time.

There was no mining division, and there were few mines when the Wilson administration took over the regeneration of the Navy. Contracts were made at once to purchase some mines abroad because none could be had in this country; but the European war coming on, it was impossible for the contractors to fill the orders. Fortunately the Navy Department in its contract had retained the right to manufacture mines in this country, and so it built its own plant. A mining division was organized, and for the first time in the history of the American Navy its position in regard to mines and mining became satisfactory. The value of this work done by the Navy can be seen by the construction of the barrage across the North Sea in 1918, this being made possible by the Navy plant for the making of mines. In this connection it is well to remember that the mines built in this country cost from \$175 to \$200 less than the price contracted for through purchase abroad. Statistics show that for every 100 mines the Navy had when the Wilson administration came into office there were 400 mines in 1916; that is, four times as many, and this number has been multiplied since that time.

There was a shortage in torpedoes, and this was remedied. For every 100 torpedoes on hand in 1913 there were 158 more ordered or in process of construction, the Navy Department constructing torpedoes at its own plant at a saving of \$1,000 on each torpedo, the capacity of the Navy torpedo works having been increased about 433 per cent.

The Navy also increased its production of powder, and as it did so private manufacturers decreased the prices from 80 cents a pound to 53 cents a pound, this being done by the direction of Congress after an investigation into its cost. The figures in 1916 showed that the Navy manufactured powder for 34 cents a pound, including all overhead charges. The reports of 1916 show that the Wilson administration had increased the capacity of the powder factory from 3,000,000 to 6,000,000 pounds per annum. This insured an adequate supply of powder for the Navy at a minimum cost.

In the matter of armor plate the policy of the Wilson administration was such as to cut down the excessive prices having previously been charged by manufacturers. Three companies which were manufacturing armor plate offered bids of identically the same price, shortly after Secretary Daniels came into office. These bids were not accepted, and the Secretary of the Navy insisted upon real competition, and by means of this \$1,100,000 was saved. Yet this large saving still left the price of armor plate well above a reasonable sum. The Sixty-fourth Congress appropriated \$11,000,000 to build an armor plant where armor plate could be manufactured at a less price than was being paid. Besides cheapening the cost of production the Government armor plate plant served to encourage Government experts to steadily improve the quality of armor to be used on Navy craft. The secrets of production discovered by Government experts will belong exclusively to the Government.

The Sixty-fourth Congress also appropriated \$705,611,000 toward a projectile factory, to cost double that sum, thus insuring an adequate supply of ammunition at cost price, this ammunition not being obtainable in 1916. I am informed that by obtaining competition \$1,077,210 was saved on a single contract for projectiles. The erection of a Government factory guarantees competition with regular manufacturers and the best quality of projectiles.

The great forward step for the Navy in the building of ships and in the general policy of expansion recommended by the Secretary of the Navy was in the adoption of what is known as the three-year building program. This was provided for in 1916, following recommendations made by Secretary of the Navy Daniels and fully supported by President Wilson. That measure provided for the construction of the largest number of fighting ships ever before authorized in one measure by any country

in the world. The bill authorized the construction of 10 dreadnaughts, 6 battle cruisers, 10 scout cruisers, 50 destroyers, 9 fleet submarines, 53 coast submarines, 3 fuel ships, 1 repair ship, 1 transport, 1 hospital ship, 2 destroyer tenders, 1 fleet-submarine tender, 2 ammunition ships, and 2 gunboats.

This program, as I have heretofore said, stopped the haphazard policy which had been the habit of the three previous administrations to indulge in, in its various administrations of the Government. In place of providing ships now and then, it set a definite and fixed figure for a number of years, the authorization being such as to make the Navy a complete whole. That program had to be halted when the exigencies of war made it necessary to enter into the construction of ships which could be made quick use of in service in the World War; but the adoption of that program and the plans for it were such as to really prepare the Navy for taking the great part in the World War which it did. That program, halted by the World War, was taken up at the end of hostilities and is now the program which is regarded as one that will put the Navy in the best shape of any navy in the world.

We are now being told that we should scrap this building program for various reasons, one of which is that the large battleships and battle cruisers are obsolete, or soon will be, because the airplane is so developed that a bombing plane can drop a bomb on one of these large ships and blow it to pieces; all of which may be true. Pursuing this argument, why not say we should have no land fortifications for the same reasons, for it would be much easier to drop a bomb on a stationary fort than one going several knots an hour. Also it is just as plausible to say we should not have any Navy except submarine chasers and destroyers because a torpedo fired from the submarine of any enemy vessel would destroy one of these large battleships just as easily and quickly as a bomb from an airplane in the air. When submarines were built to destroy these large boats, then submarine chasers and destroyers were built to destroy the submarines; so it is fair to presume that when the airplane is equipped to drop bombs on ships that the Navy will be well equipped with fighting planes to protect these large boats and all the Navy against such dangers, just as was done with the submarines.

I want to say, notwithstanding the decadent condition in which this administration found the Navy when it came into power in March, 1913, and notwithstanding the many criticisms you have heard about the lack of preparedness of the Navy when war was declared that from the time of the declaration of war by this country on April 6, 1917, to the day of the armistice on November 11, 1918, there was never a minute when a ship was ready to sail that the officers and men were not ready to man the ship; this being true not only of fighting naval craft but also of hundreds of ships carrying troops and supplies and of merchant ships. The Navy also met the necessity of furnishing 19,652 men as armed guards on merchant ships, an extra dangerous service begun before we entered the war, a service that testified to the resource of the Navy to meet any demand made upon it.

One of if not the brightest pages in American history, and especially so far as the great World War is concerned, is the part the American Navy played. It safeguarded the lives of 1,720,360 American troops and transported 911,047 the 3,000 miles across the Atlantic without the sinking of a single troopship or the loss of a single soldier on the way to France.

Brought home from Europe 1,700,000 American troops without the loss of a life or a vessel.

Put into service in European waters 373 vessels and 81,000 officers and men—more ships and more men than were in the entire Navy previous to the war.

Created cruiser and transport force that grew to a fleet of 142 vessels and a naval transportation service that operated 378 vessels.

Proposed and laid 80 per cent of the North Sea mine barrage, stretching 230 miles from Scotland to Norway, which bottled up the German submarines and put an end to this kind of warfare.

Enlisted, trained, and put into service the largest personnel ever possessed by any Navy in the world—over 532,000 officers and men, and which was 100,000 more than were in the British Navy.

Prosecuted a building program embracing 1,000 war vessels, including 275 fast destroyers of most modern type.

Designed, built, sent to France, and operated six naval railway batteries of 14-inch guns, the largest ever placed on mobile mounts and the most powerful artillery used by the Allies.

Built up a naval aviation force of 3,117 officers and 45,632 men, of whom 18,736 served in Europe.

Developed the largest radio and communications system in existence, extending to Europe on the east and Asia on the west, and from Panama to Alaska.

Developed the most successful devices used for the detection of submarines.

Designed and built the largest seaplanes in existence, the N-C type, which in 1919 made the first flight across the Atlantic.

Armed 384 American merchantmen for protection against submarines and furnished them naval guns and gunners.

Manned and operated 2,400 vessels and maintained ships in every zone of naval activity.

Increased the Marine Corps from 13,500 to 75,000 officers and men, sending 30,000 marines to serve with the Army in France.

Under Secretary Daniels the organization of the Navy was put into condition to meet the emergency call which came upon it. He democratized the Navy. He made it possible for the enlisted personnel to be increased by the wise policy of making the Navy protective to the young men. His recommendations to Congress secured appropriations which increased the material side of the Navy. The war brought a big job to this country, and the Navy did its part in executing that big job in a manner that met the highest expectations of America and the world. The American people well know that it was due to the Navy that our millions of soldiers were taken to France without the loss of a single soldier on an American troopship.

That the Navy brought them back in American ships.

That with the wonderful mine barrage in the North Sea the German submarines were shut in and the morale of the German Navy shattered.

That it was by the gallant work of our destroyers, operating with the allied navies, that the German U-boats were checked and ruthless submarine warfare defeated.

That there was a rejuvenation in the spirits of our allies when our destroyers reached the other side of the Atlantic.

War was declared on April 6, 1917. On the 4th of May, less than a month, a detachment of destroyers was in European waters. By January 1, 1918, there were 113 United States naval ships across, and in October, 1918, the total had reached 338 ships of all classes.

On March 11, 1918, a subcommittee was appointed from the Naval Affairs Committee to inquire into the activities of the Navy since our entrance into the war. The members constituting this committee were of both political parties, namely: Mr. OLIVER, of Alabama; Mr. BRITTON, of Illinois; Mr. VENABLE, of Mississippi; Mr. Littlepage, of West Virginia; Mr. Wilson, of Texas; Mr. PETERS, of Maine; and Mr. HICKS, of New York. I want to read only a part of the report made by these gentlemen. They said:

First. All appropriations have been expended or obligated with judgment, caution, and economy, when you consider that haste was necessary to bring results and abnormal conditions obtained in reference to all problems of production or operations.

Second. The Navy, with limited personnel and material, was suddenly called to face many difficult and untried problems in sea warfare, and has met the situation with rare skill, ingenuity, and dispatch, and a high degree of success.

Third. The efficiency of the Navy's prewar organization, the readiness and fitness of its men and ships for the difficult and arduous tasks imposed by war were early put to the acid test and thus far in no way have they been found wanting, and we feel that the past 12 months presents for the Navy a remarkable record of achievement, of steadily increasing power in both personnel and material, of rapidly expanding resources, and of well-matured plans for the future, whether the war be of long or short duration.

Our committee undertook this investigation expecting to find that no matter how well in the main the Navy had made its expansion into a war force we would find some matters subject to adverse criticism. We brought with us the desire to cooperate with the Navy to the one end, success. An examination of the records will show how little occasion we have had to find fault. Some mistakes, have, of course, been made, yet the Navy has shown its strength by the manner of its correction.

I also want to read what Mr. PADGETT, then chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, said on his return from Europe during the war, on the 14th day of October, 1918:

Mr. Speaker, the record made by the United States Navy in this war has not only justified the pride of the American people, but has challenged the admiration of the world. Called upon to perform tremendous tasks, some of them seeming almost impossible, in not one instance has it failed. Whenever any call has come and we are asked "When will you be ready?" as did the British admiral when the first destroyers arrived in European waters, the answer has been "We are ready now." Ready to face any emergency, ready to cope with any problem with that supreme courage and unflinching efficiency that is the tradition of the service.

The readiness of the Navy for action when the war call came was no surprise to us who were familiar with its workings, the plans that had been made, and the measures that had been taken to prepare for any eventuality. We knew that the organization was sound from keel to topmast, that the men at the helm were worthy of every trust. We knew they had been bending their energies to prepare every branch of the Navy for active service.

In June, 1918, Senator LODGE of Massachusetts, in a speech he made, said:

I did not rise to go into the details to describe to you the different naval districts of the country and what has been done in each one of them, but simply to tell you what my own opinion is, after having examined all the arrangements with the utmost care of which I was capable and with the most intense interest, and give my word for what it is worth that, in my judgment, the Navy and the Navy Department, the Secretary and Assistant Secretary, and all the officers, the Chief of Staff, and every head of bureau has done everything that human foresight could suggest.

I might go on and show how by the cooperation of the heads of the various departments of the Navy with Secretary Daniels he saved the Government millions of dollars in contracts for steel and fuel; how he ascertained the costs of manufacture of such steel as the Navy was compelled to have, and he applied that knowledge when driving a bargain with the big steel manufacturers so as to get steel for the Navy at far less per ton than was charged the Army; how when he, as Secretary, was unable to get a decent price submitted to the Navy Department as to fuel, he commandeered, and because of this had plenty of fuel at all times for the Navy, both coal and oil, and at a very reasonable price. It might be interesting to state briefly just what was done. In all, the Navy has, since July 1, 1917, procured approximately 9,450,000 tons of coal at the remarkably low price of \$2.61 per ton net f. o. b. mines, and approximately 17,700,000 barrels of fuel oil at the equally low price of \$1.53 per barrel. These prices are f. o. b. mine for coal and f. o. b. terminal point for fuel oil.

Strange as this may seem to some, this was accomplished by the department which had at its head the man who was dubbed by some yellow journals and embryo statesmen as a "country editor." There never has been a time in the history of our Navy when it was so efficiently handled, both in war and peace, as under the Daniels administration. He did not do it all, that is true; but he brought about cooperation between the heads of the various departments. In doing so he made enemies of some in the Navy Department and was and is severely criticized by those enemies and their friends; but long after these critics have returned to undistinguishable dust the record of the Navy, made under his administration, will shine forth a brilliant page in our Nation's history.

As a matter of fact the history of the Navy since March 4, 1913, constitutes what might be designated as the Golden Age of the American Navy. Whether we have reference to the preparation made before the war, or the wonderful efficiency from start to finish during the war, or the bringing back of soldiers, and naval assistance in the alleviation of suffering and the readjustments to the after-war period—in whatever way we view the Navy of these eight years—it is a record which will challenge the admiration and emulation of our own country and the world. We should feel proud of the recognition of what our Navy did in the World War, which has been given generously and freely by all the nations with whom we were allied or associated during the war. Perhaps some of our own people living in their quiet homes, not privileged to see the hundreds of naval ships doing every task which can fall on Navy ships, have not fully realized the debt they owe to those charged with the administration of their Navy, and the brave officers and men who made this new and glorious record for the American Navy.

Sir Eric Geddes, first lord of the British Admiralty, speaking about the training of American youths for service in the Navy during the war, said:

The dauntless determination which the United States has displayed in creating a huge trained body of seamen out of landmen is one of the most striking accomplishments of the war. Had it not been effectively done, one would have thought it impossible, and words fail me to express our admiration of this feat undertaken and accomplished by your Navy Department.

The French minister of marine, in a recent address upon what the American Navy did during the war, said:

As far back as May 3, 1917, destroyers sailed from America to Queens-town. In the month of November 52 destroyers were in the European waters. By means of destroyers, yachts, and cruisers it was possible to organize the convoy system, which reduced to a minimum the losses of transatlantic navigation. The most wonderful thing is that millions of soldiers crossed the ocean and not a single vessel was lost among those which carried the troops. The American Navy provided these vessels with the necessary escort in a proportion reaching 62 per cent. Seven hundred and ten convoys, representing over 7,000 vessels, have been escorted by her.

But it was not sufficient to render the efforts of the enemy submarines ineffective by protecting against them the vessels they menaced. It was necessary to chase the enemy submarines. Here, as everywhere else, it appeared that the best way to defend one's self consists in attacking one's adversary. To accomplish this important work the United States Navy employed besides its destroyers Eagle boats, submarines, submarine chasers, and seaplanes. Could we do otherwise than mention the assistance the United States Navy gave us in establishing the barrage of the North Sea? It was a gigantic task, considering that the distance between Scotland and Norway is not less than 250 miles, with a depth which for 50 miles reaches 300 meters, approximately. The United States designated 24 steamers for the ex-

clusive transport of material toward the bases organized in Scotland: 8 large vessels of a great speed were reserved for mine laying. The Americans laid not less than 5,520 mines in the course of 3 hours and 50 minutes.

Tributes of similar import might be quoted from every naval chief in every naval country and from Presidents and other rulers in nations with which the United States was associated during the World War.

When Congress declared war the Navy did not have to make plans. They were already made. More than that, every detail of mobilization possible for naval foresight to devise had been worked out. On the very day that the proclamation of war was issued the Secretary of the Navy was therefore able to bring all naval forces into readiness by the following telegram, sent on April 6, 1917, to all flagships:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1917.

Mobilize for war in accordance department's confidential mobilization plan of March 21. Particular attention invited to paragraphs 6 and 8.

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

In a statement after victory was won Admiral Henry T. Mayo, who was commander in chief of all naval forces afloat in this country and in Europe during the war, said that upon receipt of the above telegram all he had to do was to send one brief message to place the Navy in action for whatever service should be required of his fleet.

We all know that when war was declared the chief dread of American parents was not that their sons might meet death in battle, but the constant fear and apprehension that these young men, hurrying to the front to fight for liberty, would meet their deaths in the transports on the ocean from torpedoes hurled from submarines; that was the thing that gave pause and anxiety to American fathers and mothers. When the transports first began to go across taking American soldiers the submarine menace was at its height. The first convoy of ships taken over under the escort of the American Navy was attacked by German submarines, and only the skill of American naval navigation enabled these ships to get into port safely. The whole country had a sense of thanksgiving when the news came that the transports had escaped the attack of the undersea assassins.

From the first Secretary of the Navy Daniels announced that the paramount duty of naval officers and naval ships was to insure safety to transports. He declared that the American Navy would render service in every direction possible and would send its ships to protect ships carrying supplies and provisions in any place where the allied forces felt that their presence was necessary; we would send ships into the North Sea to cooperate with the allied navies so as to give an overwhelming preponderance against any possible attack by the enemy fleet, and we would make every possible contribution; but it was his fixed policy that nothing was to be considered as in any way approaching the importance of protection to the transports carrying soldiers. In pursuance of this policy, adopted on the day we entered the war and carried out until the armistice, the Secretary of the Navy sent the following telegram to Admiral Sims, who was the American naval representative in London during the time of the war:

The paramount duty of the destroyers in European waters is principally the proper protection of transports with American troops. Be certain to detail an adequate convoy of destroyers, and in making the detail bear in mind that everything is secondary to having a sufficient number to insure protection to American troops.

As a result of this policy adhered to, sometimes in the face of suggestions that the American Navy might let its ships do other important work and commit to allied destroyers the safeguarding of American troops, the Secretary of the Navy directed that American naval destroyers should always protect American transports. The result of this policy abundantly demonstrated its wisdom, and the people of America and the world can never forget or be thankful enough that this policy was adhered to and that the brave officers and men of the Navy in carrying it out prevented the torpedoing and sinking of a single ship carrying American soldiers to France during the entire war. Of course, they were attacked, but from the time a transport reached the danger zone the orders for destroyers to safeguard them going into port were carried out. As a result they all arrived in safety and not a soldier on the way to France lost his life in a watery grave. If the Navy had done nothing else during the war except to convoy the 2,000,000 soldiers to France, it would have been a record that would have won the lasting gratitude of the world, for the whole world liberty depended upon the ability of the American Navy to safely land American troops at French ports. Our ships did not indeed escape torpedoing. Some of the ships, after they had landed their precious cargoes of soldiers in France, and were returning to America

with only their crews and a few invalided soldiers, were not as adequately protected as ships going to France. Some of them were torpedoed, and a few hundred men lost their lives. When it is reflected that at the beginning of the war no man in America, no naval administrator, and no naval officer believed it possible to escape the sinking of transports loaded with soldiers, the record is almost a miracle. I am told, at the time, the Secretary of the Navy was advised by naval officers on duty in Europe that it would be impossible for all the transports to get through safely, and he was urged to prepare the American mind for losing some transports of soldiers by the enemy submarines. Knowing always the danger of it, and the imminence of it, Secretary Daniels insisted, even where there were officers of ability who advised another course, upon giving the amplest and fullest destroyer protection to the transports. It was only because the American Navy made everything else secondary, was willing to lose food and supplies rather than human life, that no American soldier met his death in the miserable way of torpedo destruction.

When the war was over and the American people were so anxious to have their boys returned home, the Secretary of the Navy sent all the older types of warships to France to help bring home the soldiers. When the soldiers were seriously needed in France, the allied navies, particularly the British, turned over large transports to take over the American soldiers, under lease to the Army. Naturally when the war was over this could not be expected, because the British were compelled to use all their transports to carry Canadian and other colonial soldiers back home, and the task of bringing our American soldiers home rapidly was a very difficult one. Under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy cruisers and old battleships were temporarily converted into transports. I have been informed naval advisers did not believe in this use of the battleships and thought that the soldiers ought to stay in France until transports especially fitted for such duty could be obtained. But, in pursuance of the policy of putting the Navy always at the service of the country, rather than looking forward purely to the naval needs, this policy was carried out by Secretary Daniels, and the War Department and the soldiers in every way possible demonstrated their appreciation of this assistance in a time of stress.

I repeat, to my mind the second most important service rendered by the Navy in the war was the laying of the barrage across the North Sea. No offensive of the war on land or sea was conceived on such gigantic proportions as laying a barrage 230 miles long across that boisterous sea through which German submarines had been constantly passing since 1914. For years the British Navy had sought in vain to shut up the submarines and keep them out of the Atlantic Ocean. They had used mines here and there, they had put down nets, seeking to make egression into the ocean more and more difficult. But when the United States entered the war the imperative need was, as expressed by the President of the United States, to "shut the horns up in their nests." In an address to the Atlantic Fleet at Yorktown, President Wilson said:

We are hunting hornets all over the farm and letting the nest alone. None of us knows how to go to the nest and crush it, and yet I despair of hunting for hornets all over the sea when I know where the nest is, and I know that the nest is breeding hornets as fast as I can find them. I am willing for my part, and I know you are willing, for I know the stuff you are made of—I am willing to sacrifice half the Navy. Great Britain and we together have to crush that nest, because if we crush it the war is won.

I am informed that on the 15th day of April, 1917, the suggestion of laying this barrage across the North Sea was made by the Bureau of Ordnance of the Navy Department. It was forwarded to London by Secretary Daniels for presentation to the British Admiralty, and it was pressed from time to time by the Navy Department. However, the British Admiralty did not for a long time see its way clear to approve the policy of the Navy Department, and word came back to America through its naval representative in London that it was not deemed feasible. As a matter of fact, the suggestion was made from London that the United States Navy should turn its attention more to other methods of assisting in the war rather than urging the laying of the North Sea barrage, which the British Admiralty had considered and had deemed "unfeasible."

Convinced that nothing could end the destruction of ships by German submarines until a barrier should shut them up in their home nests, Secretary Daniels and his advisers at Washington continued to press the matter as the only effective offensive against submarines. After months of insistence by the Navy Department, accompanied by a statement that the United States would manufacture all the mines and furnish the ships and personnel to lay the mines, or as much as the British wished us to furnish, the British Admiralty finally agreed to cooperate. The

carrying out of this great scheme cost the United States \$79,849,290.93. Seventy thousand two hundred and sixty-three mines were laid by the United States and Great Britain, of which 80 per cent were laid by the United States Navy. Even before the work was finished the barrage began to take toll, and the news that the barrage was laid and doing business gave such a blow to the morale of the German Navy that there was a mutiny at Kell and the submarine menace soon became impotent. It was effective to an ever-decreasing extent against surface craft, but the presence of an automatic net, with jaws to swallow men and ships, exercised so deterrent an effect that before the armistice submarine activity was reduced to a steadily diminishing point.

I could, if I had the time, go on and cite many other great things the Navy did during the war, but the lack of time will not permit. I am in hopes that, notwithstanding this is a Republican administration, and notwithstanding the record of this party heretofore on naval affairs, that it will not proceed to again scrap the Navy.

While I am in favor of disarmament of all nations to a minimum, I am not in favor of disarming until other nations do likewise. I hope the day may not be far distant when all the nations can reach an agreement to disarm; but while we are talking with them about it I am not in favor of us doing it while they are only talking about it. There will be time enough to declare a holiday on the naval-building program when all the leading nations of the earth have entered into an agreement to disarm, and until that time let us, as a Nation, keep intact the first line of the Nation's defense. [Applause.]

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas has used 20 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I probably shall not use all the 10 minutes assigned to me. I merely desire to express in the RECORD for the benefit of the future my personal objection to the way in which the rules now in vogue in the House are being made effective. I have no complaint whatever to make of my good friend Gov. KELLEY of Michigan. There is no man in the House whose opinion on general naval matters I would rather follow than his, and yet I must admit in all honesty that no one man, no one good man, can take the place of 21 who are accustomed to handling naval affairs.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Are there not 35 on this committee?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not on that committee.

Mr. BRITTEN. I have only a few minutes, and I do not want to get into any personal controversy at all. I suggest to gentlemen on the floor now that I am as certain as I possibly can be that the new rule under which we are now operating will be declared to be ineffective. It will have to be amended, because the business of the House is not going on in a proper and orderly manner.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS], my colleague on the Committee on Naval Affairs, suggests that there are 35 members of the Committee on Appropriations. Yes; 35, and 35 good ones. I have no complaint to make about the personnel of that committee. It is just as good and probably better than that of any other committee in the House.

But let us see what transpired. On February 2 Gov. KELLEY reported this bill to the Committee on Appropriations, and on that same morning he was directed to report it to the House. Of course gentlemen will understand that it was impossible for that committee or any reasonable percentage of that committee to consider this bill. It has not been considered by the Committee on Appropriations. No one can deny that, and yet it may be a good bill for all that.

I do not agree with it in general. I do not think this bill will maintain the Navy properly. The Navy can not possibly live and be efficient under the provisions of this bill, for the reason that the amounts were arbitrarily slashed by the one gentleman, or not to exceed two gentlemen, who framed it, and I regard them both very highly.

Now, it is very easy to say that the Navy can be successfully operated with 100,000 men, and that if the men are not available for the ships in various instances, then just put the ships in reserve. Gentlemen, that is not what ships are built for. They are not built to be just put in reserve. They are built for use on the high seas and in action and for maneuvers. The ship that is put in reserve with a caretaker on board goes to

ruin much faster than one that is constantly in use. That is false economy and poor naval action.

However, I am convinced that very few amendments can be made to this bill, because under the 5-minute rule it is impossible to materially amend a bill that has the backing of the Committee on Appropriations, and it is probably proper that it should be so. But let us see what the situation is. Under the new rule the Committee on Appropriations is supposed to bring in its appropriation bill, and the Committee on Naval Affairs is supposed to bring in its legislative bills affecting the Navy and for the Naval Establishment for the next fiscal year. The Committee on Naval Affairs prepared and unanimously reported to the House our annual so-called legislative naval bill. There was no way to bring that bill before the House except under a rule. It might perhaps be brought up in the House on Monday under suspension of the rules, or it might wait until some Calendar Wednesday and be reached in that way; but in our desire and our endeavor to work in cooperation with the Committee on Appropriations we took 8 or 9 or 10 of their amendments—amendments prepared, I believe, by the gentleman from Michigan, or the chairman of his committee—and on their request we incorporated those amendments in our legislative bill so as to work in harmony with the Committee on Appropriations.

We did that. The first nine sections of our bill, I believe, consisted of amendments prepared by the Committee on Appropriations in order that we might work harmoniously with them and come as near as possible to complying with the new rules of the House. What was the result? The gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] and I appeared before the Rules Committee the other morning and asked for a rule; and we stated that that rule was recommended and approved and desired not only by our Committee on Naval Affairs but by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. GOOD]. It was desired by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], who, with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES], framed this bill. They were in favor of the rule.

The Rules Committee heard us courteously, gave us all the attention to which we were entitled, and then declined to give the rule for reasons best known to themselves, and probably for good reasons. I have no fault to find with the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Not now, please. I have only a few moments. I have no fault to find with the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to tell the gentleman how he can get a rule.

Mr. BRITTEN. If the gentleman will tell me how we can get a rule, I will yield to him.

Mr. BLANTON. If you will just knock out every piece of legislation in this bill from the first page to the last, you will find that the Committee on Rules will grant a rule to put it back.

Mr. BRITTEN. It is my intention to make this bill conform to the new rules of the House and to eliminate all legislation subject to a point of order. That is the only way the House and our committee can be informed as to just how much of the bill properly belongs under our jurisdiction. All points of order successfully maintained will naturally throw that language to the Naval Affairs Committee, where it belongs.

We desired to come in here with a bill containing legislation approved by the Appropriations Committee and to work with that committee so far as we could.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman agreed to yield me 15 minutes originally.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BRITTEN. If the gentleman will assist me in getting a little more time.

Mr. GARRETT. I wish to say to the gentleman that, as one member of the Committee on Rules, I do not know why the rule was not granted.

Mr. BRITTEN. I thank the gentleman. There is probably a policy established here by the steering committee or by the majority members of the Committee on Rules, which policy I am willing to adhere to. And, remember, I am not criticizing anybody in particular, but I do suggest to the House that the rule under which we are now operating can never be made effective nor can it be made successful. We may go on and promote legislation. I do not doubt that. The House does

many things in a more or less irregular manner. We may promote a lot of legislation, but we are not promoting good legislation in the way that it ought to be promoted. You gentlemen realize that legislation for the Navy is just as important as are appropriations. They should go together. We had one suggestion in our bill, prepared, I believe, by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. Goon], that will ultimately have to be cared for, either by adopting his suggestion or else by an appropriation of \$125,000,000 for the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. That has got to be done sooner or later. There were numberless other pieces of important legislation. We provided for the concentration of naval districts throughout the country. That was done, I believe, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY]. That is an excellent idea and a step in the direction of economy. It can not be made effective without legislation. We had provided it in our bill, yet there is no chance, I repeat, to get that legislation before the House. This appropriation bill will probably come back here from the Senate loaded with all sorts of legislation, and if you want to make the Senate the legislative body for the House, this is the best way to do it.

Mr. BUTLER. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUTLER. Will my colleague state to the committee how much each year we would save to the Government if we were permitted to legislate as to the naval districts alone? Does my colleague remember that the clerk hire for three naval districts is \$275,000 a year, which could be wiped out by consolidating the districts?

Mr. BRITTEN. I will say to our distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee that many of these matters were covered in our bill at the request of the Committee on Appropriations. Now, it was suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson], and it was suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon], and by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] and others, as a means of caring for the situation, that we might incorporate into this bill these various suggestions for economy. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon] suggested that we might offer our bill in separate amendments, either to his deficiency bill or to the pending appropriation bill, and I said in reply, "What becomes of the Committee on Naval Affairs when your committee legislates for us?"

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will yield, I made no such suggestion.

Mr. BRITTEN. I did not say you suggested it. I said you said you would include them in your bill.

Mr. GOOD. I said if there was legislation that the Committee on Naval Affairs desired, if some member of that committee offered it I would have no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is substantially what I said.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman's complaint is against the Rules Committee for not bringing in a rule.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, no.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Wait one moment. The gentleman, I think, will agree that if this committee brought in an appropriation bill and attempted to enact legislation upon it, under the old rule it would have been subject to a point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. True.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Nobody in the House would make the point of order, but now because some gentlemen are peeved they make the point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. I do not know about any Members being peeved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore].

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the House last Monday passed the bill (H. R. 15873) to authorize the appropriation of additional sums for Federal aid in the construction of post roads, and for other purposes, and I wish to submit some remarks, including some statistical data.

Mr. Chairman, the bill that passed the House Monday, which there was almost no opportunity to discuss, authorizes an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1921, to assist the States in the construction of highways. The bill represents the maintenance and continua-

tion of the policy of Federal aid, first definitely expressed in the act of 1916. That act provides and contemplates Federal appropriations to be apportioned to the States on a composite basis of population, area, and mileage of mail routes. It restricts the use of Federal-aid funds in the construction of any highway to \$10,000 per mile and not more than 50 per cent of the cost of construction. The limit was subsequently raised to \$20,000 per mile. Appropriations heretofore made to carry out the statutory plan have amounted to \$275,000,000.

The bill followed hearings held by the House Committee on Roads. On May 11, 1920, there was a hearing which was attended by many of the State highway commissioners. They united in presenting to the committee resolutions that had been adopted, without any dissent, by the American Association of State Highway Officials, urging that to the appropriations already made there should be added the sum of \$100,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1921, 1922, 1923, and 1924. The commissioners who explained the 4-year program were unanimously of opinion that the results of the legislation of 1916 have verified the predictions of its most sanguine supporters in the encouragement and vigor it has given highway construction; that the Federal and State authorities are in energetic and harmonious cooperation; and that nothing could have been done so calculated to create such activity and progress as this legislation has brought about. United opposition was voiced to the substitution of any plan which would place highway construction under the exclusive control of the Federal Government, confining it to a few important interstate roads. It was submitted with great force that such a step would be reactionary if taken for the purpose of superseding or interfering with the present plan, and, if taken at all, should be supplemental to that plan.

After the May meeting the matter was held in abeyance by the committee until December 14, 1920, when, under the leadership of Mr. G. P. Coleman, chairman of the executive committee of the American Association, who is the Virginia State highway commissioner, many members of the association, speaking for all of the States, reiterated and amplified the views that had been previously presented. They were most earnest in supporting the 4-year program and in asking that it be made operative at the earliest possible date.

While some of the members of the committee, thoroughly satisfied that the plan now in effect is the best that can be devised and is not likely to be changed in the future unless by being liberalized, favored reporting the 4-year bill, the committee finally determined that the bill authorizing an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the next fiscal year should be reported—the bill that has passed the House.

Among those who have advocated as expedient and necessary a further appropriation at this session of Congress are the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Agriculture. From the latter have been obtained the statistics of which I shall make use.

Some have contended in criticism of the attitude of the Federal and State officials that there is no reason for an immediate appropriation, and that action might well be delayed to some undesignated time in the future. They justify this contention by pointing to the fact that a portion of former appropriations remains unexpended which is sufficient to take care of much construction during the next fiscal year. But what is the situation? Prior to January 1, 1921, there had been apportioned to the States \$266,750,000, which is the total of \$275,000,000 less the administrative charge of 3 per cent. There had been paid, or was due the States on account of completed work, \$83,632,282, and there had been pledged on uncompleted contracts, \$66,050,825. There was thus left a balance of \$117,066,893. The estimated commitments for the rest of this fiscal year on account of projects approved and in process of execution will be not less than \$50,000,000, and probably considerably more. Thus there will be unexpended and unpledged on the 1st of July next, at the outside, not more than \$67,066,893.

The work of construction, which was retarded during and for a period after the war by the shortage of labor and the lack of material and the means of transporting material, is now being actively prosecuted and will be continuously pressed on the basis of an expenditure during the present calendar year of at least \$100,000,000. I refer to the Federal funds alone. These figures would show the desirability of the additional appropriation being made even if the system were purely national instead of involving 48 States, some of which have gone forward with the work more rapidly than others. The conditions in the several States vary greatly. Approximately one-half of the States will have placed under contract by the 1st of July, 1921, the funds allotted to them, and those States will be halted

in prosecuting their work and making new contracts unless they have by that date the benefit of an additional allocation. Those States are not confined to any one section of the country, but represent every section. In the course of the brief debate on the bill, I said:

The vital fact is that unless this appropriation is made, in some States work or the negotiation of contracts will be halted, because they have already absorbed their allocations by actual expenditures or contracts to which expenditures have been pledged. Those States are Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, and Illinois. Other States have gone so far in absorbing their allocations that they will be compelled to let up on contracts during the first half of the next fiscal year in the absence of an appropriation. Some of those States are Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, and Louisiana.

The situation in Virginia is as follows: The amount apportioned to Virginia of the \$275,000,000 is \$5,451,730.28. On the 1st of January of this amount there had been assigned to projects under construction and partly completed \$2,676,337, the projects being nearly one-half completed. Since January 1 there has been assigned to other projects \$91,000, and by January 1, 1922, there will be assigned to still other projects at least \$1,684,393.28. The three sums last mentioned will exhaust the amount of the allocation to Virginia, and the fiscal year will still have six months to run.

To those who argue that if an appropriation is now made it may not be largely used during the first half of the next fiscal year and may not be wholly used during the second half, the reply is, first, that such can not be the case in some of the States, and, second, that if it is the case in certain of the States the money will remain in the Treasury, which is a circumstance that does not make against the expediency of the appropriation since it will not be to the disadvantage of the Government.

Besides the importance of having the money in hand to aid the States that will need it early or late during the next fiscal year, there are other fundamental considerations that can not be lost sight of. The construction of a great system of good highways is possible only under some permanent plan expressing the deliberate purpose of the Government. It is essential that the States should know whether or not the present plan is to be continued in effect, and an appropriation will furnish the best evidence that it is not to be abandoned or in any way weakened. Should any doubt be created by a failure to make this appropriation, which will be a response to the impressive appeal of all of the States, the States will inevitably be placed in a condition of uncertainty, and embarrassed in making their arrangements for the future. These arrangements ordinarily require legislative action, and the point was stressed in the hearings before the committee that the legislatures of a large number of States will be in session this winter and not in session again until 1923. Now that conditions are becoming more normal, labor and material more plentiful, and transportation facilities ample, the States are prepared to push the work of construction with great rapidity. They are providing funds, employing engineers, and otherwise organizing their activities, and contractors are entering the field of competition. Any misgiving as to the policy or action of the Government will occasion discouragement and tend to throw the States back into the condition that obtained prior to the policy of Federal aid being adopted. The States are willing and eager to exert themselves, but most of the States find it impossible to do what ought to be done without Federal aid.

No question is or can be raised as to the plan being constitutional. Nor can any question be raised as to the primary and growing importance of far better highways than those now existing. Nothing will more directly and greatly contribute to the prosperity of the entire country, both urban and rural, than to furnish better means of travel and better means of transportation for the products of the soil. The era of railroad building has passed and the time has come when if traffic is to move at all an appreciable part of it must move over the public highways. It is estimated that during the last calendar year approximately 350,000 tons of farm products and vegetables were hauled to market in motor trucks by the farmers and gardeners of the United States. All of the people are vitally interested in the welfare of the rural communities where the necessities of life are produced, and everyone recognizes that nothing should be omitted that can be done to insure their prosperity. Since the last census figures were published the attention of the country has been drawn to the fact that the population is steadily drifting away from the rural sections into the cities. There has been no reversal of this tendency at any time. In 1890, 29.5 per cent of the population of the United States lived in cities of over 2,500 inhabitants; in 1890, 36.1 per cent; in 1900, 40.5 per cent; in 1910, 46.3 per cent; and in 1920, 51.4 per cent. In the decade between 1910 and 1920, 45 of the 100 Virginia counties lost population and 52 lost in the number of farm operations. Seventy-five of the

counties lost in one way or the other. It is sometimes suggested that there is nothing in the movement away from the farm to excite alarm. This suggestion is reiterated by a writer in the Atlantic Monthly for February, who says:

The falling off of farm population is not, as many suppose, in all aspects an alarming thing. It represents in large part the improvement which has been made by the city dweller and manufacturer in the processes applicable to the farm. New forms of machinery adapted to farm use have been devised which make it possible for far greater acreages to be handled by these machines with far less human labor. This contribution made by the manufacturer to the improvement of the condition of the farm renders unnecessary the continued employment there of human labor to the same extent as before. Farming sections that show a falling off in the number of inhabitants are very largely sections to which agricultural machinery has gone in large quantities.

It is, of course, true that improved machinery has helped to offset the loss in population and the number of farmers, but it is not a complete and persistent offset. Production is not increasing correspondingly with the increase in population. On the contrary, it is decreasing. While the population of the country has increased in the last decade 14.9 per cent, crop production has remained about stationary. For instance, it was almost the same in 1919 as in 1910; and in 1920, it was less than in 1912 and 1915. What is happening is further illustrated by the increase of importation into the United States of foreign agricultural products similar to those that are produced here. The following figures, obtained from the Tariff Commission, show the increase of the importation of some commodities in 1920, as compared with 1900:

	1903	1920
Cattle.....	\$2,267,681	\$45,081,179
Meat.....	1,214,148	20,581,219
Butter.....	9,769	10,915,770
Cheese.....	1,781,613	6,180,972
Seeds.....	1,795,048	113,032,112
Sugar.....	100,250,974	688,127,380
Tobacco.....	13,297,223	78,164,280
Wool.....	20,260,933	212,848,568

So we have here a serious rural problem. It is the same problem that 20 centuries ago tried the wisdom and ingenuity of the Roman statesmen. Toward the end of the republic agriculture was failing; toward the end of the empire it had failed. A recent writer says:

Rural population fled from the country to the crowded cities, whose wealth had been acquired through war and commerce. Chained by the cities' attractions, they faced distress and hunger rather than go back to a rural life of comfort and plenty.

Another writer belonging to that period says:

From one end to the other of Italy there was barely a trace of agriculture. She consumed; she did not produce. It was because of this that she fell.

No American profiting by the lessons of the past and deeply hopeful of the future will believe for a moment that any such fate is in store for this country, but experience must admonish him that it is the imperative duty of the Federal Government and the States, and individuals as well, to bend themselves to the effort to foster in every legitimate manner the interests of agriculture, so as to hold the people to the soil and make sure that the country shall be self-sustaining or shall at least not steadily more and more fall short of producing what it needs.

It has been said that the plan of Federal aid is unfair because it places an undue burden upon certain States that contribute very heavily to the Federal revenue. It has been stated that the section east of the Mississippi River and north of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers pays about 84 per cent of that revenue. Discussing before the committee the theory embodied in that assertion, Mr. S. E. Bratt, superintendent of highways of the State of Illinois, said:

I come from a State where we pay \$2.25 income tax for every dollar of Federal aid we get, yet we are wholeheartedly for this measure. We have in the State of Illinois the city of Chicago, which happens to be the headquarters of a great number of corporations whose plants and industries are located in other States.

All of the profits accruing from these various industries—agriculture, mining, lumber, etc.—come in the regular course of business to Chicago, are paid out from that office, and are taxed from that office, and are credited to the State of Illinois. This is true also of Pennsylvania, with the cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh; also of Massachusetts, with the city of Boston; and in a much greater degree with the State of New York, with the city of New York. But if you compare the Federal distribution under the Federal aid act with the basic production of each of the States—that is, their production of minerals, lumber, and all classes of agricultural products—you will find that the comparison is very close. For example, the State of Illinois produces 5.13 per cent of the basic products of the United States, while it receives 4.51 per cent of the Federal allotment. I submit, therefore, that the amount of Government tax as paid by a State is not a fair basis of comparing the distribution of Federal road funds, because these taxes, especially as applied to income and excess-profits taxes, are drawn from other States as well as the State in which the tax is paid.

A table to which Mr. Bratt referred shows that in 1919 the total value of the basic annual products of the United States from farms, forests, and mines, namely, mineral products, lumber, wool, poultry and eggs, dairy products, domestic animals, and agricultural crops, was \$30,251,702,506. The following summary indicates the proportion of that total produced by each State, and the proportion of Federal aid received by each State in the allocation of the \$275,000,000 heretofore appropriated under the present highway plan:

State.	Per cent of production.	Per cent of Federal aid.
Alabama.....	2.26	2.17
Arizona.....	2.17	1.41
Arkansas.....	2.01	1.73
California.....	2.70	3.14
Colorado.....	1.30	1.79
Connecticut.....	.35	.63
Delaware.....	.14	.17
Florida.....	.64	1.18
Georgia.....	2.64	2.78
Idaho.....	.84	1.26
Illinois.....	5.08	4.51
Indiana.....	3.07	2.78
Iowa.....	4.85	2.98
Kansas.....	3.73	2.96
Kentucky.....	2.52	2.01
Louisiana.....	1.97	1.40
Maine.....	.61	.99
Maryland.....	.69	.90
Massachusetts.....	.46	1.52
Michigan.....	3.24	2.98
Minnesota.....	3.39	2.93
Mississippi.....	2.21	1.85
Missouri.....	3.27	3.50
Montana.....	1.38	2.06
Nebraska.....	2.78	2.20
Nevada.....	.43	1.33
New Hampshire.....	.29	.43
New Jersey.....	.49	1.23
New Mexico.....	.70	1.65
New York.....	3.05	5.13
North Carolina.....	2.90	2.35
North Dakota.....	1.33	1.58
Ohio.....	3.83	3.82
Oklahoma.....	3.98	2.38
Oregon.....	1.42	1.63
Pennsylvania.....	5.50	4.73
Rhode Island.....	.07	.24
South Carolina.....	2.04	1.48
South Dakota.....	1.73	1.67
Tennessee.....	1.96	2.33
Texas.....	5.43	6.03
Utah.....	.96	1.17
Vermont.....	.45	.47
Virginia.....	1.86	2.05
Washington.....	1.72	1.49
West Virginia.....	1.99	1.10
Wisconsin.....	2.95	2.62
Wyoming.....	.62	1.26
	100.00	100.00

The vote on the bill in the House was 278 for and 58 against. Should the Senate take favorable action, the policy expressed in the act of 1916 may be regarded as a policy so firmly settled as to be beyond the reasonable probability of reversal or any harmful modification.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia yields back one minute.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have that minute to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is in the control of the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I withdraw my request.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I object.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 35 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to discuss the provisions of the bill now under consideration. I realize the condition and what I might, perhaps, be justified in calling the hysteria in the country for economy. By hysteria I mean a predominant feeling among the people for curtailing expenses and for economy; and I wish to say at the outset that I fully sympathize and concur in every legitimate aim and purpose for economy. But that raises at the outset the question, What is real economy? I desire to say that under all circumstances

withholding appropriations is not always economy. Economy is the proper and judicious expenditure for necessary and proper achievement; so that we should guide our judgment of what is economical, what is proper, by the standard of its necessity and the wisdom of the action to be taken.

I realize also that all of the appropriations provided for in the pending bill will have to be administered and executed by a new Secretary of a different political affiliation. So that what I have to say is in no sense partisan or intended to be political. I would not be fair to the House or just to myself if I refrained from calling attention of the members of the committee and of the House to what I conceive to be the results of this bill upon the Navy.

I desire also to call attention to the fact that, in my judgment, the new Secretary of the Navy, when he assumes the duties and obligations of administering the Navy, will find himself very much handicapped and will find himself necessarily resorting to methods and to conduct in the administration of the Navy that will be embarrassing to the administration and which will be detrimental to both the Government and the interests of the Navy.

I wish now in advance to exempt the new Secretary of the Navy from responsibility for the conditions which will confront him, and which will be subject to criticism if we are to be governed by the history of the past. He will have to adopt methods necessarily that have from time to time, to my own certain knowledge, been severely condemned and severely criticized by Members of the House upon the now present majority side of the House, and in the press of the country. But the new Secretary will not be responsible for those conditions. They rest with the Congress.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] called attention in such a nice and splendid way to the growth and the development of the Navy that I shall not attempt to enlarge upon it. Suffice it to say that in 1913 the American Navy was claimed to be about third class. There were some who reckoned it at fourth class. To-day we have a Navy, when the present building program is completed, that in military value, in fighting efficiency, which is the purpose and aim of the Navy, will be first class.

I want to say that in offering the suggestions which I do that I am doing it for the purpose, if possible, of maintaining the high standard of the Navy, its usefulness, its efficiency, its military value, for the good of our country, because I believe as the first line of defense of the country, different from the Military Establishment, the country should always have and maintain a Navy of first value compared with the other navies of the world.

I wish to make some observations with reference to the statements in the report. If you will turn to the report you will see a number of tables of analysis giving comparisons with the current fiscal year 1921 and also with the estimates submitted, and with the recommendations of appropriations in this bill.

Inadvertently and unintentionally these comparisons are misleading. It is true that in the body of the report the committee calls attention to the fact that there was a deficiency appropriation reported and carried in a bill just passed by the House an hour or so ago of about \$61,000,000, but it is not set forth and not referred to in the tabulation given, and when you come to compare the tabulation there is a danger of being misled and getting an entirely erroneous conception of what this may mean. For instance, on page 13 of the report we find the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. In the column headed "Appropriations for 1921 in the naval, deficiency, and other acts," the total is given for the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts of \$169,376,537, which includes the "pay of the Navy," "provisions for the Navy," "maintenance," "freight," "fuel and transportation."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think the gentleman will understand very clearly that the deficiency which he speaks of had not at the time the report was made been even reported by the Committee on Appropriations, and it even yet has not become a law.

Mr. PADGETT. I know that to be correct.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And we could not of course include that in the report.

Mr. PADGETT. I said in the beginning that in the body of the report attention is called to the \$61,000,000 deficiency carried in the deficiency bill, but to the lay reader these comparisons are misleading, and I want to state wherein they are so.

Under the heading "Amount recommended in bill for 1922," the total is given as \$184,311,935.50, and under the column

"Increase or decrease, compared with 1921 appropriation," it is stated that there is a surplus of \$14,985,398.50 for those items which I have mentioned, whereas, as a matter of fact, there was a minus or a decrease of \$40,064,601.50, or a difference between the plus and minus of this report of \$55,750,000. How is that made up? Take the pay of the Navy. They report for the pay of the Navy, \$120,876,537 for the fiscal year 1921, but that ignores the fact that in the deficiency bill there was carried a deficiency of \$30,000,000 for that item, so that when they come to the plus or the minus sum they gave a plus of \$12,325,726 for the appropriation in the present bill, whereas when you consider the deficiency there was a minus of \$17,674,274 in the pay of the Navy.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that item of the pay of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman would not have the House believe that the same appropriation will be required next year that is required this year, when the Navy is larger now than it will be next year?

Mr. PADGETT. No. I am going to call attention to that. The report states that the cause of the reduction was because, instead of appropriating for 143,000 men in the Navy, they were appropriating for 100,000 men, and instead of appropriating for 27,400 men in the Marine Corps they are only appropriating for 20,000. What are the facts? The current fiscal year, including all deficiencies, is only for 120,000 men in the Navy instead of for 143,000, and for 20,000 in the Marine Corps instead of 27,400—Marine Corps identical in the two bills; so that the statement that the reductions are largely due to this reduced number is overdrawn.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Is not the statement that the reduction is below the estimates?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Is not that correct?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it is below the estimates.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The estimates were based on 143,000 men in the Navy and 27,400 men in the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. That is true.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Then the statement in the report is correct?

Mr. PADGETT. No; the statement in the report is correct so far as the estimates are concerned, but it is not explicit in calling attention to the fact that, instead of being based on 143,000 men, it is based on 100,000 men, when it is 120,000 for the present fiscal year, 1921, and 100,000 men in the Navy for the fiscal year 1922, and identically the same—20,000 men—in the Marine Corps for both years.

Take, if you please, the next item of maintenance. It is stated in the plus and minus column that there is a reduction of \$1,500,000 as between the two years, whereas, counting the deficiency, there is a minus or a reduction of \$2,250,000. Again, under freight, there is a plus given of \$2,000,000, whereas, counting the deficiency of \$5,000,000, instead of a plus of \$2,000,000 there is a minus of \$3,000,000. In fuel and transportation there is a plus given of \$7,500,000 over the appropriations of the fiscal year 1921, but the fact is ignored that the deficiency bill carries a deficiency of \$20,000,000, which, added to the \$10,000,000 in the original bill, makes a minus of \$12,500,000, instead of a plus of \$7,500,000, for fuel and transportation.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Take the deficiency for fuel in the Navy. The gentleman understands that the Navy Department paid something like a little over a dollar a ton more for coal this year than it did last year, and that is a cause of the deficiency?

Mr. PADGETT. I am going to discuss those matters a little later on and get the facts before the committee. The gentleman is anticipating my argument.

Let us return now to the Marine Corps, on page 15 of the report. In the comparison, in the plus and minus column, there is reported by the committee a minus for provisions of \$285,548. The report ignores a deficiency of \$1,300,000, so that it is a minus or reduction of \$1,585,548, instead of \$285,548. Take the item of fuel for the Marine Corps. In the plus and minus column it is put down as a plus of \$140,000 over this year, more than the 1921 appropriation, but a deficiency of \$250,000 is ignored, which converts it into a minus of \$110,000. Take the item of transportation and recruiting; it is put down as a minus of \$50,000. A deficiency of \$385,000 is ignored, which makes a minus or reduction of \$435,000. Take the item of repairs of barracks; it is put down as a plus of \$200,000, and there was a deficiency of \$150,000, and that converts it into a plus of \$50,000 instead of a plus of \$200,000.

Take, if you please, forage. It is put down as a minus. There is a minus of \$40,000 because they appropriate the same this year that they appropriated in the original bill last year, ignoring the deficiency of \$40,000. Take commutation of quarters. It is put down as a deficiency of \$250,000. They had an appropriation of \$250,000 last year, and they did nothing whatever for commutation of quarters. There was a deficiency last year of \$175,000, so that instead of being a minus of \$250,000 it is a minus of \$250,000 plus a deficiency of \$175,000. Take, if you please, contingent. They put down a minus of \$740,322 whereas there was a deficiency of \$700,000, making a deficiency of \$1,040,000, a minus or reduction. Now, then, they put down as a total of these items a plus of \$158,552.42 as more in the present bill than for the fiscal year of 1921, whereas in the Marine Corps there is a deficiency, there is a minus of \$3,201,447.58. Now, I have called attention to these to illustrate the haphazard, the harum-scarum method of appropriating. There has been no method. It has not been according to any standard. It has not been according to the testimony taken, but it was arbitrary.

The committee just said, "We will fix this and this and this as the amount of these different services," ignoring the facts. What does it mean, my friends? It simply means that here is a bill that is going through which, if it becomes a law as it is, will hamper and embarrass the administration of the Navy and will necessarily compel them to come back here in succeeding Congresses to secure large and indefinite deficiencies in the year to come. Now, I call attention a little further to this. I went to the chiefs of the bureaus and asked them to give me a statement of these various items and what it meant to the administration of the Navy, and let me call your attention to them. Here is one from the Marine Corps, signed by Gen. Lejeune, major general, commandant. What is it? Take provisions. They testify that the present commutation value, the present cost during the year of provisions, three meals a day for the marines, was 68 cents. That estimate took into consideration that with a reduction in the price of food it might come down to 60 cents, but that was the lowest safe minimum, and yet they have put in a provision here which carries it down to 47 cents. The committee state in their report 50 cents as the basis. This is for three meals for the fighting men of the Marine Corps. Can you get three meals a day for 50 cents? The department wanted 60 cents. They have ignored—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The testimony shows that in 1918 the actual cost for the ration of the Navy was 48 cents.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In 1919 it was 55 cents.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. With the reduction of prices which everybody knows is in existence at the present time, what is there unreasonable about fixing it at 50 cents?

Mr. PADGETT. But you have got it below 50 cents.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; it is 50 cents.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think there is any justification in the matter of feeding the men—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Can the gentleman tell me why the Navy ration should cost more now than it did in 1919?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; because everything else is selling higher now. My ration costs me more now than it did in 1918.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. These supplies are bought by the wholesale, and wholesale prices are from 30 to 50 per cent less than they were six months ago.

Mr. PADGETT. Not that much. In reaching that 60 cents they took into consideration all of those things. Now, let me call attention again to clothing. The committee reports an appropriation of a million dollars for clothing. They fixed the number of men at 20,000. A million dollars will only provide clothing for 10,000 men under the law, and the officers say that when they made their estimate for \$2,000,000 they took into consideration the stuff on hand and the reserve, and yet arbitrarily the committee has fixed \$1,000,000, and that \$1,000,000 will only be sufficient to provide clothing for 10,000 men and leave 10,000 unprovided for. Take military stores, which embraces a variety of articles as specified in the bill. Operating account, Marine Corps, they appropriate \$500,000, which will provide under the law for 13,200 men instead of 20,000 men. Now, I go back to provisions. On the basis of the 60-cent ration the appropriation will care for 16,500 men. What is the result, my friends? Under the provisions that are made and the appropriations that are carried in this bill, while there is an authorization for 20,000 men the provisions of the bill will take care of only from 10,000 up to 16,500 on the different items of appropriation.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. AYRES. Does the gentleman know what provision was allowed for the Army per day?

Mr. PADGETT. Forty cents.

Mr. AYRES. This is 10 cents more than is allowed in the Army.

Mr. PADGETT. Well, the law prescribes the ration in both cases that shall be furnished, and the Navy ration as prescribed by law is one-third more in quantity, and on account of the conditions under which it has to be served is far more expensive. It has to be fixed so that it can be carried on ships. The Army is carried in the quarters, and the law has always recognized that difference.

I have an estimate here referring to that very item. There is a difference of not less than 50 per cent between the naval ration and the Army ration in the cost, and if you put on the 50 per cent it would run up to a 60-cent ration. I want to call attention to Steam Engineering. I asked Admiral Griffin to give me a statement of what this bill meant to his bureau. He says:

The estimate under this appropriation, made in such manner as the estimate of the preceding year, for which there was a deficiency of about \$1,250,000, was \$33,670,000, based upon an enlisted force of 143,000 men. The reduction consequent upon a reduction of the personnel to 100,000 men was estimated at \$3,045,000, leaving a net estimate for engineering of \$30,625,000.

The appropriation is \$29,500,000.

Now, he says:

There are a number of what may be called fixed charges that are paid from this appropriation, the one for classified force amounting to \$2,500,000; another, the maintenance and operation of the Coast Signal Service, will run from \$2,500,000 to \$3,000,000. These two items alone amount to, say, \$5,000,000.

The maintenance in operating condition of the shop equipment for the machinery division of navy yards is also paid out of this appropriation, and this is conservatively estimated to cost about \$1,250,000 per annum. These three items alone amount to about \$8,250,000, leaving about \$14,000,000 available for repairs and upkeep of the machinery of ships, the revised cost of which is estimated at nearly \$16,000,000.

It will thus be seen that not only can the ships contemplated for commission not be kept in repair, but there will be absolutely no money whatever to cover their maintenance and operating expenses. This latter item will amount to about \$7,000,000.

So you see the condition in which this bill is placing the Navy.

Now, I will take "Construction and repair." I asked Admiral Taylor the question, and he says here that the lowest amount for the purpose was \$31,000,000. He states the matter frankly, and says there will be no deficiency, but—

there is already an accumulation of ships at the yards which can not be repaired this year out of the \$31,000,000. Deterioration and depreciation go on steadily, and with an amount of \$22,500,000 only available, our ships during 1922 will obviously not be kept up to the proper standard.

Is that economy? Is that proper legislation? I dare say not.

Now, I want to call attention to ordnance—guns, and so forth. I have here a letter of Admiral McVay, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, in which he states that if the amount called for in the bill alone is appropriated it will necessitate the curtailment of the operations of his bureau, and not only the curtailment but contracts that have been authorized heretofore in the law and made will have to be readjusted. He will have to go to these men and make an adjustment with them that will slow down their production, which means higher cost to them, and which will mean, as he states here, that there will be large sums against the Government for damages incident to the failure of the Government to carry out its contracts for armor, for guns, and for materials, and all the things that come under the Ordnance Department. He states that instead of being economy, it will be a waste and will be a deterioration of the ships. He says also that there are many inventions that have been shown to be necessary as a result of this late war, improvements in gunnery, improvements in torpedoes, improvements in many of the mechanisms of the Ordnance Department, none of which can be carried out and all of which will be suspended, and which means that the Navy will deteriorate and will suffer as the result of these things.

Now, I want to call your attention, if you please, to a memorandum from the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the same kind, but I shall not dwell at length on it. It calls attention to the fact that in the yards of the country repairs will have to be neglected, waste will go on, deterioration will accumulate, and that later on there will pile up huge additional costs and expense upon the Navy Department.

I want to call your attention to another matter, and that is the personnel. The authorized enlisted personnel of the Navy, in round numbers, is 143,000 enlisted men, but we have not had that number since soon after the armistice. Men began going out, until the Navy went down to 100,000 enlisted men. In order to check that, in order to encourage men to come back and

to meet the conditions, last May we passed a bill giving additional compensation and increasing the pay scale of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps with reference to commissioned and enlisted personnel. As the result of it, the Navy commenced coming back, until to-day we have in round numbers about 135,000 men. But the average was less than 120,000 last year, because that was all that was appropriated for, and the department kept within the appropriation for the number provided for. Now, it is proposed to reduce it to 100,000 men. Just see what that means. You have got 100,000 men for the Navy, all told. Out of that 100,000 men 3,500 are in the Hospital Corps, fixed by law; 3½ per cent of the enlisted personnel goes into that corps; 3,000 are required for aviation, 2,000 for radio, and 5,000 are estimated for the training schools and shore stations, making 13,500 to be deducted from the grand total of 100,000, or bringing it down to 86,500 men with which to operate the Navy. Now, what does it mean? I went to Admiral Washington and Capt. Williams, in the Bureau of Navigation, and said to them, "Give me a statement as to what this means on the operation of the ships."

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] stated that it would keep all of our dreadnaughts in commission. I must disagree with him. I have a statement, received this morning, to the effect that if the personnel was reduced to 100,000 men the ships of the Navy will be in the following status: Battleships, first line, in commission, 13, counting the *California*, that is not yet in commission, but is nearing completion and is expected to be completed and put in commission during the next fiscal year; out of commission, 2 of the dreadnaughts, and in reduced commission, 2 of the dreadnaughts, making a total of our dreadnaughts, counting the *California*, 17. Battleships of the second line: In full commission, none; out of commission, 18; in reserve, 3; making a total of 21. Take destroyers: In full commission, 96; out of commission, 1; in reserve, 187. Take destroyers of the second line: In commission, none; out of commission, 21.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. On page 924 of the hearings the gentleman will find in the statement of the Secretary of the Navy this proposition. He says, speaking of the number of men provided for in the appropriation:

However, we can keep in commission all of the late dreadnaughts, half of the destroyers, others of the best ships, and place the other destroyers in a reserve state, enough to keep them from deterioration; and by close economy all along the line we can run the Navy in a way to keep the latest ships manned with 100,000 men.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I know the Secretary makes that statement. But when you come to the man who has the technical knowledge, who has the administration of it, and who takes the ships and the men to go upon each ship and assigns the number to the ship required, you have not got them. The Secretary was speaking just generally. He was not taking up the matter in detail.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. On page 65 of the hearings is the statement of Admiral Coontz, who has charge of the operation of all the ships for the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but not of the designation of men to the ships.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Admiral Coontz says the same thing that the Secretary says. Why not attach some consequence to the statements of the two men who run the Navy absolutely, one of them the civilian head and the other the military head?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and both of them are dealing with general policies and purposes, and neither of them is dealing with the specific question of the assignment of men to the ships and the operation of the ships themselves. There is a vast difference.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman assert that the Secretary of the Navy and Admiral Coontz, the Chief of Naval Operations, the civilian and the military heads of the Navy, do not know how many ships they can keep in commission with 100,000 men?

Mr. PADGETT. I say that, generally, as they are speaking there, without going into detail—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They did go into detail, showing exactly the number of men required on each ship.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but I have it made out right here and given. I have taken up the various items here. I will put it in the Record. What is the sum total? We have 814 ships in the Navy. Under the 100,000 men provided we will keep in commission 371; out of commission, 153; in reserve, 262; in reduced commission, 28.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Have I used 45 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Can the gentleman from Michigan give me two minutes?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am sorry I can not. I would be delighted to. However, I will take the chance at one minute, if that will help the gentleman.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to call attention in that one minute to the fact that this bill makes no appropriation for outfits on first enlistment. The law provides that every man who enlists at first shall have an outfit, at a cost of \$100. You can not get them out of the stock; you have to have an appropriation for them.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman is wrong on that. The outfits on first enlistment are not paid for. They are held in general stores and issued to the men without being paid for. There was no appropriation for it last year.

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly by the men, but the bureau has to pay for it out of its fund.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; we authorized last year the issue of clothing to the men without cost, and the gentleman's committee reported a similar provision.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but you have not any provision authorizing that now and there is nothing in this bill authorizing the General Account of Advances or the Supplies and Accounts to turn these goods over to these men. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Can the gentleman from Kansas give me five minutes?

Mr. AYRES. I greatly regret I can not.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CRAMTON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 15422) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. OVERMAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendments bill of the following title:

H. R. 15344. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] has said that there seems to be a sort of hysteria of economy sweeping over the country, and he intimates that that hysteria had attacked the members of the Committee on Appropriations, including the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], who had so much to do with preparing the bill. The bill carries \$395,000,000 in round numbers. Last year the appropriation bill carried, if I remember rightly, \$433,000,000. The bill of this year is less by \$38,000,000 than the appropriation of last year. Including the deficiency of \$31,000,000, concerning which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] spoke, there would be a difference of \$69,000,000 in favor of this bill rather than against it, as I look at it, and if we include \$30,000,000 which was caused by an increase of pay, we have still a larger amount of difference, namely, \$99,000,000, which we have saved as compared with last year's bill.

Is this hysteria, or is it genuine, sane economy? I will undertake to show in the time allotted to me that, if anything, the bill has really exceeded the limit to which it ought to have gone rather than fallen below it.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] especially criticizes that part of the bill which limits the personnel of our Navy to 100,000 men, and gives as his reason that this number will not man the ships that we have in commission. Be it so, then let us reduce the number of ships we have in commission. If England, whose fleets must encircle the globe, and which could be starved out in a few weeks by any power able to blockade her coasts, can get along with 105,000—if England, which has a navy which in tonnage and number of vessels is nearly double

ours, can so limit the personnel of her navy, is it not mere inefficiency on the part of our officers if they can not operate our Navy with 100,000?

I am aware of the position which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] takes with reference to naval bills. I have had some experience in discussing them with him and have learned that the gentleman from Tennessee takes the word of these naval officers as his absolute law and gospel. I had evidence of that last year when we were discussing the naval bill. At that time I made the statement that England was not building a single capital ship; that she had actually scrapped three that had well progressed on the ways; and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] rose in his seat and said he hoped the gentleman from Iowa would not be misled by mere newspaper rumors, which was a polite way of saying that I was entirely erroneous in the statement I made and had better go and inform myself. The House is probably aware that I do not make statements of positive fact upon mere newspaper rumors, but that is neither here nor there. I was at the time, I confess, just a little irritated by the statement which was made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], but when I came to look over the testimony which had been given by the naval officers who appeared before the committee I entirely excused him, because those naval officers had scouted the idea that England had stopped the construction of capital ships, and the gentleman from Tennessee was simply following blindly the statements which had been made to him by naval officers in the committee room. Now, everybody who has examined into the question in the least will admit that the statement which I made a year ago was absolutely correct. England not only stopped building capital ships some two years ago, and has not laid down any since, but she scrapped three large ships that were in the course of construction. She has also scrapped between 150 and 160 ships that were more or less obsolete. Yet the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] fears that we are not going far enough in this bill.

Why is he alarmed? Whom have we to fear? I am one of those who consider that a war with England should be absolutely unthinkable. With full confidence in the rectitude of our intentions, England has given a hostage to us in leaving Canada wholly unprotected. But even considering England as a possible rival, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] said, and he spoke with moderation, that the present program will make our Navy equal to that of Great Britain.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. Nobody is asking in this bill for any new construction. It is only to take care of that which we have already authorized. This is not for new construction.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is only \$90,000,000 in this bill for new construction—just a mere trifle!

Mr. PADGETT. That was authorized in 1916.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Of course, it was authorized in 1916, but we are going to build now. Some of the vessels upon which it will be expended are partly constructed, others have not yet been started.

The navy of Germany, which at one time we regarded as our principal rival, now lies beneath the waters of Scapa Flow, except insignificant portions of it which are still upon the waters in the custody of the Allies. The navy of France or Italy is not to be mentioned in comparison with ours. England has, as I said before, stopped building capital ships, for reasons which I shall undertake to explain, if I have the time.

As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] has well stated, the navy of Japan has not half the power of ours. Is it not time for us to exercise some economy? Is it not time that we stopped listening to these gentlemen who are officers in the Navy and whose ideas of the space that our Navy ought to occupy are limited only by the boundless ocean that surrounds the world, the illimitable air above, and the unsounded depths of the sea beneath? If we followed their statements, instead of this bill carrying \$400,000,000 it would carry \$1,000,000,000. Nothing less would satisfy them.

And, if gentlemen please, that is not the worst of the situation. If there is any trouble about this bill—and I do not care to criticize it—the trouble with it is not so much with the \$395,000,000 which it appropriates but the fact that the naval program upon which we have entered has no limit and the ships to be built are of doubtful value. Let me show you where we are going. About 1910 we launched the first dreadnaughts of the American Navy, the *Michigan* and the *South Carolina*. England a short time before that had launched the ship called the *Dreadnaught*, which gave the name to this type, which ship, however, was not started until after ours had been begun.

These were the first and big-gun ships. From the time that they were launched every one of the predreadnaughts became obsolescent. They are now obsolete. Yet the gentleman from Tennessee would like to have them manned. That is one reason why he wants so many men in commission. We have some 25 of these predreadnaught ships, which were magnificent vessels in their time, and cost about \$150,000,000, but which are now as useless for war purposes as the toy dreadnaughts made of tin with which children play. The gentleman from Tennessee wants them manned and the naval officers that he spoke of want them manned. What has England done with that class of ships? She has scrapped them mercilessly, and that is what we ought to do. We ought not to keep one of them in commission or even keep a man on them to guard them, because they are not worth it.

Any money spent upon them is all wasted, wasted entirely. They can neither fight the dreadnaught nor can they run away from it, because their guns have not the range or power to contend with them, nor is their armor sufficiently heavy, nor have they the speed to enable them to escape from the dreadnaught. In case of a war they are merely floating coffins. That is the situation with reference to the ships which the gentleman from Tennessee complains will not be manned under this bill. For my part, I do not want them manned; I want them put in the scrap pile, where they belong.

The other day England consigned to the scrap a cruiser, a more speedy cruiser than any we have, and for fighting purposes about as good as any we have got in our Navy. Why? For the same reason—it could neither fight nor run away from the battle cruiser, which, with superior guns and superior speed, could stand off at any range it saw fit and sink these old armored cruisers, just as Admiral Sturdee did with the German fleet of armored cruisers in the naval battle off the Falkland Islands. I agree that the scout cruiser provided for in the bill should be constructed, because all the cruisers we now have are obsolete; but a doubtful question arises—a very doubtful question, in my opinion—whether these great ships we are constructing will actually be of any value when they are built. I am aware gentlemen will at once say that my opinion of these matters is not valuable, and I admit it, although I have always been a student of naval activities, naval construction, and naval warfare. But the statements I make in this respect are backed up by some of the greatest naval experts that the world has ever had. The great question now being discussed in England is whether these enormous battleships and battle cruisers, such as are provided for by this bill, are of any use. What do naval experts say about this? Two of the foremost authorities in England with reference to naval construction and naval science are the late Lord Fisher and Sir Percy Scott. Lord Fisher had an almost uncanny faculty of prophecy as to the direction which naval architecture and naval construction ought to take. He was wonderful in the accuracy of his prediction as to the course of naval science. And what does Lord Fisher say on this subject? As far back as September 12, 1919, he wrote:

Air fighting dominates future war, both by land and sea. It is not my business to discuss the land, but by sea the only way to avoid the air is to get under the water. So you are driven to the internal-combustion engine and oil. That is why I keep on emphasizing that the whole navy has to be scrapped.

Sir Percy Scott is one of the most distinguished inventors, as well as naval scientists, known to the present day. He was the inventor of the fire control which, with various modifications, has been put on all the recent fighting ships, and which, with some adaptations, has been put on all the dreadnaughts we have. I am glad to say that the naval officers have not asked anything so foolish as to equip the old ships which are to be scrapped with this system, however necessary it may be on the modern ship. Now, Sir Percy Scott says:

The introduction of the vessels that swim under water has, in my opinion, entirely done away with the utility of the ships that swim on the top of the water. The submarine causes to disappear three out of five of the functions, defensive and offensive, of a vessel of war, as no man-of-war will dare to come even within sight of a coast that is adequately protected by submarines.

With a flotilla of submarines I would undertake to get into any harbor and sink or materially damage all the ships in that harbor. If by submarines we close the egress of the North Sea and Mediterranean, it is difficult to see how our commerce can be much interfered with.

In another article he points out that in the last war England's Navy was not able to keep at sea; for the most time it was shut up in the harbor; that it never was able to blockade the enemy's ports or to attack them. It never was able to fight the enemy except when the enemy chose to come out and meet it. Another authority points out that in every battle they had except those down off the west or the east coast of South America, where no torpedo craft was engaged—in every battle where they

had the use of the torpedo craft it turned the tide of battle. In the great Battle of Jutland, Admiral Beatty, as shown by the official report, found it necessary to divert the fleet at a very important point on account of torpedo attack.

In the earliest naval battle of the war, when the English battle cruisers were pursuing the German battle cruisers and succeeded in sinking the German battle cruiser *Blucher*, they were compelled to turn back, according to the official report, by reason of a torpedo attack and submarines; and on another occasion, which is reported, I recollect, some time in June, 1916, the British admiral wired first to the port, "I shall engage the enemy in a few minutes and am absolutely confident of the result." And what occurred? Torpedo craft and submarines came on the scene of action, two of his light cruisers were sunk, his fleet turned back, and never went into action at all. The British Navy undertook to maintain battleships on the Mediterranean during the war, and they were unable to do so on account of torpedo craft.

What do we know with reference to this matter from more recent experiments? What is the opinion of Gen. Mitchell with reference to whether aircraft can successfully attack the big battleships of to-day? I have never seen an official report of his testimony, and therefore in this respect I am compelled to rely upon newspaper statements, but, if correctly reported in the newspapers, Gen. Mitchell, who is one of the few men in charge of aviation who is actually a flier himself, says that with a proper flotilla of airplanes he would undertake to destroy battleships whether in harbor or upon the sea at full speed. It is also reported—and here again I do not state it as an absolute fact, because I have no official record of it—that the English, for the purpose of testing this question, had a fleet of battleships lying in a harbor attacked by airplanes. The officers of the fleet knew that they were to be attacked, but they did not know when or at what time the attack would begin.

First, one division of airplanes flew over the ships at a distance where they could not be reached by antiaircraft guns and dropped smoke-screen bombs down. Under the cover of the smoke screen another division of airplanes dashed in upon the fleet, successfully attacking it either by dropping bombs or with torpedo planes, so that the ships were put out of action.

Whether the day of the big battleship is past or not, it appears to me quite plain that we can reasonably expect such advance and improvement in airplanes and submarines that these colossal ships will be obsolete by the time they are completed. In any event, the expense of maintaining them is staggering. Few people have any conception of their size. These leviathans are to be of 43,000 tons, and their cost will be around \$40,000,000 each. The battleships will cost considerably less, and the battle cruisers, as I believe, much more. The battleships are to have 60,000 horsepower and the battle cruisers 180,000, or more than the great Keokuk Dam now produces. The British estimate of the upkeep of their battle cruiser *Hood*, which is a smaller vessel, with less horsepower than ours, at £539,000 a year. At this rate the upkeep on ours, allowing for the increased cost of everything in this country, would be at least \$3,000,000 a year. These giant vessels are to be 860 feet in length, and their draft is so great that there are few harbors into which they can enter. I am unable to obtain any official estimate of the fuel cost per annum, which necessarily will depend much on the time they are kept at sea. They are oil burners, and I would estimate the annual cost for fuel to be at least \$1,000,000 a year. If 1,500 men are kept aboard them—and I think it will take 2,000—it will cost over \$3,000,000 a year to man one of them. I have no hesitation in saying that when we complete this program of construction, the cost of maintaining and operating our fleet, without any new construction, will be greater than the amount carried by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, when we have done all this—when we have spent, as the reports estimate, \$973,000,000, and I believe it will be more than a billion dollars—we will have only completed one round of the vicious circle in naval construction, with its ever-mounting costs; for if these ships are of any use some other nation will feel compelled to build bigger and more powerful ones, which we must match. Such a situation calls imperatively for action toward an agreement with other naval powers to prevent the fatal folly of its continuance. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY. May I have permission to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

Mr. CONNALLY. It is upon the bill.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I will have to be consistent, and I have objected to the others, and I do not think that—

Mr. MADDEN. Regular order!

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I object.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KENDALL].

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday last there appeared the following statement regarding the United States Public Health Service Hospital, situated at Markleton, Pa., in the district which I have the honor to represent:

Nearly 100 veterans, about all of them tubercular and most of them gassed or wounded on the other side, were sent for treatment to a place at Markleton, Pa., situated in a low, marshy river bottom, with a lot of railroad tracks and cinder piles hard by. A great tuberculosis expert sent there to examine the place, after the boys finally protested, said that "they might as well have sent them to a coal mine for treatment." F. W. Galbraith, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, after visiting the place, demanded that the men be removed. He said that their condition there was "unbelievable"; that men "were dying off like rats in a hole, with moldy clothing on their backs."

This statement was made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD], and while I do not think the gentleman deliberately misstated the facts, I want to denounce the entire statement as absolutely untrue and without any foundation in fact. The facts concerning this institution are as follows: It is located on the main line of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, between Connellsville, Pa., and Cumberland, Md., at an elevation of 1,700 feet, on a hillside sloping down to the Casselman River, surrounded by wooded hills that tend to protect it from the high winds and equalize the temperature, but not sufficiently close to prevent the admission of sunshine. In short, a good location and easily accessible. This statement regarding location is contained in the report of the committee of the American Legion, sent to Markleton to investigate, by Col. David Davis, commander of the American Legion in the State of Pennsylvania.

No great tubercular expert was sent to Markleton, but the opinion of the greatest tubercular expert in the country, and the man who is now writing the history of tuberculosis in the great World War, Dr. George E. Bushnell, who directed the hospital during its occupancy by the Army, and before the Public Health Service took it over by lease, is as follows:

The hospital at Markleton, in addition to providing 400 beds, has the further advantage of its situation, in a portion of the country somewhat removed from other hospitals. It provides, in other words, for the western portions of New York, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, and this provision of local hospitals, while the principle should not be carried too far, is nevertheless one that is approved by the people and therefore should make for contentment. I should prefer to retain an institution which is well removed from other institutions of the same kind and at the same time is near large centers of population, for this reason alone. It is therefore recommended that the hospital at Markleton be not abandoned, but continued in use for the treatment of tuberculosis, and that necessary repairs and new construction be authorized and carried out without delay.

Dr. Joseph Walsh, of 2026 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, operated the hospital during its occupation by the Army, and under his administration the hospital made the second best record in the United States. It was also one of the most economically administered. Dr. Joseph Walsh is one of the most eminent authorities on tuberculosis in the country.

Col. F. W. Galbraith, national commander, American Legion, has never visited Markleton, and I desire in this connection to read a letter from him, dated January 25, 1921, as follows:

Hon. S. A. KENDALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KENDALL: I am in receipt of your letter of the 23d, delivered by Capt. C. H. Scott, which I have carefully read. In reference to the statement attributed to me that "Markleton Hospital was not fit for a dog," I have never made this statement as regards Markleton, but referred to Sunnyside Hospital, and quoted from the report which I have concerning that institution. I have no objection to the publication of this letter in any way deemed necessary.

Yours, very truly,

F. W. GALBRAITH, JR.,
National Commander.

Mr. CRAGO. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KENDALL. I will yield.

Mr. CRAGO. My personal information is to the effect that Markleton Sanatorium is a very high-class sanatorium, and years before the war people of Pennsylvania and surrounding States were glad to spend their good money going there for treatment on account of its healthful conditions. Has the gentleman any information bearing directly upon that point?

Mr. KENDALL. This hospital was famed not only in the State of Pennsylvania but in the surrounding country as one of the first sanatoriums in the eastern part of the United States.

Eminent physicians testified to its fitness and desirable climatic conditions, as is shown by the following letters from Dr. W. K. Walker, professor of psychiatry, medical department, University of Pittsburgh, and Dr. Theodore F. Diller, consulting neuropsychiatrist for the United States Public Health Service, Pittsburgh, Pa., and a member of the staff of St. Francis Hospital at Pittsburgh, and Dr. John A. Lichty, member of the State Board of Charities of Pennsylvania, and professor of medicine in the medical department of the University of Pittsburgh.

DECEMBER 17, 1920.

My attention has been called to certain newspaper and other reports to the effect that Markleton is not a suitable place for the treatment of the sick. I feel this criticism to be unjust and therefore wish to make the following statement:

The Markleton Sanatorium has been for a long time looked upon with favor generally by the medical profession of western Pennsylvania as a place for the treatment of the sick.

I have referred many patients to this sanatorium and have myself been over the premises at different times in the past 10 years. I consider it favorable, especially from the standpoint of climate, being located, as it is, in the Allegheny Mountains, at a moderate altitude, and at a reasonable distance from any large industrial center, thus insuring the most favorable atmospheric conditions for the sick.

Because of this altitude it is free from the oppressive heat of the summer, and, being surrounded as it is by hills, gives the place an additional advantage of the bracing winter atmosphere of the mountains, at the same time protecting it against high winds and winter storms. This, together with its other natural advantages, such as a large gravity water supply, abundant coal supply on the premises, makes this particular location, it seems to me, an ideal one for the treatment of the sick, and especially so for that particular type of sickness for which it is now being used by the United States Public Health Service.

Very respectfully, yours,

W. K. WALKER.

DECEMBER 16, 1920.

Re Markleton Sanatorium.

Surg. Gen. HUGH CUMMINGS,
United States Health Service, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Understanding that the matter of taking over Markleton by the Government is under advisement, I am taking liberty of writing you regarding the matter.

I have known Markleton Sanatorium for many years. It is delightfully situated in the mountains of Somerset County, along the line of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. The surroundings, walks, drives in different directions are delightful. I have myself rambled all over the woods for miles about the place. During the long period this place was conducted as a sanatorium I sent many patients there and I myself frequently visited the place, often staying for a day or two by way of a little outing or recreation. The place filled a great need in this community, and it was with regret that I saw it lost to us as a sanatorium. I consider the place with its surroundings a very attractive one as sanatorium or hospital.

Very truly, yours,

Dr. T. M. T. McKENNA,
Professor of Neurology, Medical Department,
University of Pittsburgh.

Dr. THEODORE F. DILLER,
Consulting Neuropsychiatrist for United States
Public Health Service, Pittsburgh, Pa.,
Member Staff St. Francis Hospital, Pittsburgh, Pa.

4634 FIFTH AVENUE,
Pittsburgh, Pa., December 24, 1920.

This is to certify that I have been acquainted with the Markleton Sanatorium for the past 21 years, having been connected with the institution as assistant physician in the summer of 1899 and also having sent patients to this place from time to time ever since.

I consider it an excellent location for health purposes. The elevation is good, there is good water, and the drainage is good. There are possibilities for development which are scarcely surpassed by any other location I know.

Sincerely, yours,

JOHN A. LICHTY.

This hospital was operated most successfully by Dr. Joseph Walsh, under the direction of Dr. George E. Bushnell, whose reports and patient records are as follows:

From: Col. G. E. Bushnell, U. S. Army, retired.
To: Chief of the Hospital Division, Surgeon General's Office,
Subject: Retention of hospital at Markleton, Pa.

1. The hospital at Markleton, Pa., was acquired at a time when it appeared to be necessary to arrange with the utmost speed some accommodations for tuberculous cases. At the present time several large hospitals are nearing completion, and the immediate needs of the moment are not pressing. In view, probably, of these considerations and also under the impression that the cost of the necessary renovation of the buildings now standing and the construction of additional buildings will be very expensive, the proposition has been made to abandon this hospital.

2. This course is not recommended for the following reasons:

(1) The nature of the lease is such that the Government is bound in honor to pay the rental whether the institution is made use of or not. If it is not used, the rental is, of course, a total loss. This is, of course, objectionable, but it would be still more objectionable if the cost of maintenance and construction were so excessive as to more than balance the expenditure for rent. This is not believed to be the case.

(2) As far as maintenance is concerned, this hospital is situated on a main line of an important railroad near large markets, so near coal fields that fuel should be very cheap; in fact, the ground leased is said to be underlaid with coal which can be mined without running shafts.

(3) With reference to the cost of construction, the following figures are obtained from the books of the hospital division, and relate in part to expenditures already made and in part to estimate for construction

not yet authorized. The figures are, of course, therefore, to a certain extent approximate. They are as follows:

Allotted for 6 T. B. wards, of which 3 are built.....	\$46,350.00
Spent on miscellaneous repairs to sanatorium proper.....	5,128.07
Estimate for 2 medical department barracks, 1 medical department mess and kitchen, 1 nurses' quarters, 1 storehouse, 1 nurses mess and kitchen, heating plant for same.....	90,000.00
Heating T. B. wards.....	14,000.00
Boiler and smokestack.....	2,250.00
Large boiler (estimated).....	15,000.00
Year's rent.....	20,000.00

192,728.07

With reference to the cost of the large boiler, the chief owner of the Markleton Sanatorium, Miss Margaret B. Barnett, has shown me a letter in which a boiler firm has agreed to install a 125-horsepower tubular boiler for \$12,000. An estimate of \$15,000 has been made in order to be on the safe side.

The total of the foregoing data, namely, \$192,728.07, may very possibly be exceeded if the construction contemplated is authorized. It is not believed, however, that the amount spent in excess of this sum will be so large as to make a very material difference. The cost per bed with this figure, allowing a capacity of 400 beds, would be \$481.75. Supposing that the total cost of construction is \$200,000, the cost per bed would be \$500.

In view of the fact that in many cases hospitals have cost from \$1,500 to \$2,000 per bed, it is seen that there is no force in the argument that the cost is particularly excessive at Markleton. In fact, it is doubted whether any other institution has ever been made ready for use with a less cost per bed than \$500 during the present emergency.

The only question that remains, apparently, is whether the cost of administration of so small a unit would be so excessive as to make the project undesirable. In the days when it is common to speak of large aggregates of hospitals, each containing 1,000 beds when several hospitals are under construction with a capacity of from 1,500 to 2,000 beds, a hospital of 400 beds seems almost ridiculously small. At the same time, under antiwar conditions, a hospital of 400 beds was larger than many hospitals in the United States devoted to tuberculosis, with one or two exceptions. For the care of 400 patients, a certain number of experts in various lines is necessary. When the number of beds is multiplied by four, a larger number of experts is necessary and the overhead expenditure which is the department in which saving is chiefly made in large units, is apparently administered more economically, because there is but one adjutant, one quartermaster, and one supply officer required, but on further investigation it will generally be found that in large institutions the single adjutant, quartermaster, and supply officer will all call for assistants in their specialties, and the difficulty of administration and the consequent skill and experience demanded of the officers in charge is rapidly increased by the increase in the size of the institution, so that a man who is, perhaps, only competent to act as assistant to the adjutant or quartermaster in a hospital of 1,600 beds may be quite competent to act as the chief of his department in a hospital of 400 beds. It is therefore believed that there is no very great gain in the matter of overhead expenses by abandoning a hospital of this size. This would be the case, of course, if the hospital had 40 beds. It is not believed to be the case in a hospital of the size of 400 beds.

3. While, as has already been stated, the needs of the moment do not urgently require the retention of Markleton, in view of the fact that an Army of enormous size is apparently contemplated at the present time, it would seem unwise to dispense with an institution which has been and is at all satisfactory in its results. The hospital at Markleton, in addition to providing 400 beds, has the further advantage in its situation in a portion of the country somewhat removed from other hospitals. It provides, in other words, for the western portions of New York and Pennsylvania, West Virginia, etc., and this provision of local hospitals, while the principle should not be carried too far, is nevertheless one that is approved of by the people and therefore would make for contentment. I should, therefore, prefer to retain an institution which is well removed from other institutions of the same kind and at the same time is near large centers of population for this reason alone.

4. It is therefore recommended that the hospital at Markleton be not abandoned but continued in use for the treatment of tuberculosis, and that necessary repairs and new construction be authorized and carried out without delay.

G. E. BUSHNELL,
Colonel, United States Army, Retired.

[Statement of Dr. Joseph Walsh, Philadelphia, Pa., in regard to the suitability of the Markleton Sanatorium for tuberculosis.]

JULY 1, 1919.

As Dr. Joseph Walsh was the commanding officer of the Markleton hospital while under the control of the Army, an interview was sought with him, and he made the following statement:

"The hospital proved suitable during my stay, and because of its sheltered position protecting it from high winds it would seem to be a most desirable place for the tuberculous. It is also desirable because of its distance from large towns and also because of the pureness of its atmosphere. The patients did exceedingly well, and I will be glad to forward my case records for the period during which I was in charge."

PHILADELPHIA, June 30, 1919.

Col. W. H. WALSH,
United States Public Health Service,
Fifteenth Street and Ohio Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

My DEAR COL. WALSH: Inclosed statistics of the tuberculous patients whose treatment was completed. In addition to this number there were 207 transferred to other hospitals.

Very truly, yours,

JOSEPH WALSH.

Statistics of United States Army General Hospital No. 17, Markleton, Pa., from time of opening, March, 1918, till closing, March, 1919.

Total number of tuberculous patients.....	237
Discharged to duty (31.65 per cent).....	75
Discharged, arrested, or practically to resume old occupation (46.41 per cent).....	110
Discharged practically unimproved (12.23 per cent).....	29
Discharged progressive (4.22 per cent).....	10
Died (5.48 per cent).....	13

Hon. S. A. KENDALL, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

PHILADELPHIA, January 5, 1921.

My DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I had the pleasure of being commanding officer of the United States Army General Hospital No. 17, Markleton, Pa., from November, 1918, until April, 1919. From the point of view that it is at a distance from a large city, I thought it was a suitable place to take care of tuberculous patients, because there were no seductions to overexertion. As far as the treatment of tuberculosis is concerned, it is not important where the patient is, but what he does. If he follows the proper régime, rest, sufficient fresh air, and sufficient good nourishment, and is a curable case, he will get well any place; and if he does not follow out this régime no place will benefit him.

Our results while I was in Markleton appeared to be as good as any place where I have treated patients.

Very truly, yours,

JOSEPH WALSH.

With reference to the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD] that the boys were dying off like rats in a hole, I yesterday called up the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Dr. Cumming, and was informed that 350 patients have been treated at the hospital at Markleton since its opening in November, 1920, out of which number but 8 have died. The Public Health Bureau has given me the names of 6, as follows:

Paul Menges, Lewis Raittenen, Fred Clausen, Samuel W. Jacquette, Joseph A. Bauder, and Frank J. Bedley, all of whom were far-advanced cases of chronic tuberculosis, according to the statement of the United States Public Health Bureau. The names of the other two patients were not obtainable at the bureau, as the reports had not been sent in.

Eight patients out of 350, about 2 per cent, would not bear out the statement that the patients were dying like rats in a hole.

On Thursday, January 13, 1921, a committee from the American Legion, of Pennsylvania, appointed by Col. David Davis, State commander American Legion of Pennsylvania, visited the hospital to investigate, and reported to the State commander as follows:

Your committee interviewed Maj. Williams, commanding officer of the hospital, who gave it certain information and opinions of great help. He stated, among other things, that it is a known and proven fact that treatment of tuberculosis should be carried on under climatic conditions as similar as possible to those existing where a patient suffering therefrom expects to spend the succeeding years of his life; and that this hospital is the only one in this district utilized for the express purpose of such treatment by the United States Public Health Service; that he had had long experience in the treatment of tuberculosis in Asheville, N. C.; that the temperature was a most important feature in the treatment, and the temperature here was ideal; that there was not too much moisture, was plenty of fresh, pure air, good water supply, coal mine on the premises, and proper isolation for tubercular treatment in that its location tends to lessen the probabilities for excitement of patients, which is most important; that in general the location could not be improved upon as a tubercular hospital if placed in the proper physical condition and repair; that the property was run down and needed extensive repairs to the power plant, building and equipment, and that there should be a system of drainage constructed to deflect surface drainage from temporarily constructed barracks; a swampy spot at the lower corner of the property, near the river, should be drained or filled; a new heating plant should be installed on account of the inadequacy and condition of the one in present use; and that, in his opinion, the whole property could be placed in first-class condition in every way with an expenditure of about \$150,000, the major items being power plant, heating apparatus, and drainage systems for barracks and swampy section.

In regard to the water supply, Maj. Williams stated that it was far more than adequate in amount; that at the intake of the piping system the water supply is absolutely pure, but that some pollution occurs between the intake and the outlet, the cause not having been ascertained. He also stated that in the past there has been considerable trouble with certain patients who did not observe rules and were constantly trying to cause trouble among the other patients—they gambled, came in drunk at times, and went A. W. O. L.—in fact, were most radical in every way in attempting to disrupt the organization and discipline; that, however, these men have been transferred, have been discharged, or have deserted, and some of them have been responsible for unwarranted, untrue, and scurrilous attacks through the press and other mediums which have caused many people to entertain untrue and unfounded opinions of the hospital, and which have caused many men who have been assigned there for treatment to refuse to go; and that at present there are only 14 patients in the hospital, and all are apparently well satisfied and contented and cause no trouble.

Your committee also interviewed several of the patients privately in their rooms and received the following information: That the meals are good, with plenty to eat and variety; that they object to being kept in the end of the main building, which is not heated, having to dress and undress four times a day in the cold rooms, and the fact that even the recreation and reading room is so cold that they shiver while there; that there is no hot water in this building for their use, except in the shower bath, which they are not permitted to use.

(The above conditions could be remedied by using barracks erected for the treatment of patients, inasmuch as comfort of patients was considered when the barracks were built. The patients at present are confined to the administration building.)

The results of this investigation by your committee caused it to form the following opinion:

GENERAL LOCATION.

On the main line of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, between Connellsville, Pa., and Cumberland, Md., at an elevation of 1,700 feet, on a hillside sloping down to the Casselman River, surrounded by wooded hills that tend to protect this location from high winds and equalize the temperature, but not sufficiently close to prevent admission of sunshine. In short, a good location and easily accessible.

GENERAL CONDITIONS OF BUILDINGS, EQUIPMENT, ETC.

In general, the facilities available are entirely adequate and suitable for tubercular treatment, but the buildings and equipment have been allowed to deteriorate to such an extent that a considerable expenditure of money will be necessary to place this institution in the shape in which, it can easily be seen, it was before being taken over by the Government, and in addition, the laxity in the care of new equipment is obvious. As an example of the latter, screening on the porches has been allowed to rust and become full of large holes, regardless of the fact that new screening was furnished last year, is on the premises, but was never placed. Another example is shown by the fact that a large laundry machine to replace old equipment and a new kitchen range have been allowed to remain outside and unprotected from the weather for some time. Easily constructed drainage ditches could have been dug around newly erected barracks to obviate the formation of pools under the building in order to prevent dampness from penetrating the barracks and injuring clothing and furnishings therein. The motor equipment, with the exception of a Ford touring car, has been allowed to get out of condition, and has never been repaired, thereby making it necessary to carry patients on stretchers from the railroad station to the hospital in case they were unable to walk. Other instances came to your committee's attention which made it apparent that the present faults in physical condition are due very much to mismanagement and lack of interest of those in charge.

SUITABILITY FOR USE AS A TUBERCULOSIS HOSPITAL.

The location in itself appears most suitable for such a purpose. From reports of geological surveys the precipitation here is no greater than in any other part of the State. It is easily accessible from all parts of this district. It is the only hospital in this district used by the United States Public Health Service for the exclusive treatment of tubercular ex-service men, and in view of the fact that tubercular patients should be treated under the same climatic conditions in which they expect to live in the future, your committee considers it most important that such a hospital should be maintained in this region and that the facilities here available should certainly be utilized. It is very unfortunate that many unjust and harmful reports have been circulated about the suitability of this hospital for the purposes intended, even though certain criticisms concerning the personnel, discipline, and unfair treatment of patients may have been true. We consider the latter, if true, to be faults of the administration and not of location or physical condition.

During the time while the Army maintained this hospital there were over 800 patients cared for at a time, and as late as last August, while under control of the United States Public Health Service, there have been as many as 180 patients, while at the present time there are only 14 patients. Why the number has been reduced so low at the present time when hospitals are needed so much for tubercular ex-service men we are unable to say, except that the commanding officer stated that men had been discharged as cured, had been summarily dismissed for misconduct, had deserted, and had been transferred to other hospitals, and among those transferred were over 20 who were sent to a hospital in Tennessee a month or so ago.

Your committee therefore recommends, in view of their investigation of the Markleton Sanatorium and believing that this institution is a suitable and proper one in every respect for the treatment of tuberculosis, that the executive committee of the Department of Pennsylvania of the American Legion go on record as favoring the retention of this sanatorium as a United States Public Health Service hospital; that the proper repairs be made and equipment supplied; and, further, that a complete change in executive control be made in order to place this institution on a sound business basis. It is therefore moved that this report be adopted and that the American Legion be urged to take definite action for rectification of existing conditions.

Respectfully submitted,

C. C. McLAIN, Chairman.
S. A. BALTZ, M. D.
C. A. THOMPSON.
L. MCK. CRUMRINE, Secretary.

The report of this committee was made to the executive committee of the Department of Pennsylvania at a meeting which was held at Harrisburg, in the State capitol, on Monday, January 17, and the recommendations were unanimously adopted. This report was transmitted to the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service by Col. David J. Davis, in the following letter:

SCRANTON, PA., January 24, 1921.

THE SURGEON GENERAL,
United States Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Attached hereto is a copy of the report of the committee appointed to investigate the conditions at Markleton Hospital, together with their recommendation.

The report and recommendations were unanimously adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, at a meeting of the committee held at Harrisburg on January 17, 1921.

In view of the urgent necessity for such an institution in Pennsylvania, it is requested that immediate steps be taken to remedy conditions at this hospital, and same be placed on a sound basis as recommended by the committee.

In order to avoid delay, I have requested Congressman KENDALL to bring this matter to your attention at once.

Very sincerely,

DAVID J. DAVIS,

Department Commander Pennsylvania American Legion.

These are the facts regarding Markleton. That institution has been allowed to deteriorate because of the gross mismanagement and maladministration of the Public Health Service, and under the direct supervision of Dr. F. C. Smith, against whom I have filed with the Secretary of the Treasury charges of gross neglect of duty, usurpation of authority, insubordination, and general incompetency in the management of the hospital.

There is no man in Congress who has done more for the soldier boys in his district than I, nor no man who is more willing to see that the boys who saved the country receive

everything to which they are entitled from a grateful Nation; but I am not willing to permit the Public Health Service to wreck the institution at Markleton, when our boys need hospitalization as badly as it appears they do judging from a letter received by Senator ASHURST from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. La Porte, that the number of patients was increasing at the rate of 1,000 a month, and it is my conviction that when a hospital has been operated by the Army with as much success as was the hospital at Markleton, the service men should not be deprived of such a hospital because of the maladministration and inefficiency of the management.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to a statement made by my beloved friend from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], a gentleman for whom I have the highest respect and confidence, and I will make no apology for what I am stating, as the gentleman from Illinois is intimating on the quiet, inasmuch as I know the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] and know his worth and know he desires to be absolutely fair, as he always is.

But he has made a statement in this report of his which I think may be misleading, unintentionally so, and I want to comment on it so that the public will not be led away by this misleading statement of the gentleman from Michigan. He states:

This bill carries \$23,655,318.51 for the officer, enlisted, and civilian personnel employed in connection with aviation activities and other items of which aviation receives the benefit.

Now, according to the figures, that is correct; but the gentleman has had to go through the departments with a currycomb and bring down every item that he could find and charge it to aviation. It seems to me, in all fairness, it would have been wise to put in this report the comparison between the expenses last year and the expenses this year. We appropriated last year \$20,000,000 under the head "Aviation," which did not include these pay and subsistence items, and yet the gentleman from Michigan would have the public believe that this year we are appropriating \$23,000,000 as compared to \$20,000,000 last year.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We appropriated more than \$20,000,000 last year.

Mr. HICKS. As the gentleman from Michigan says, we appropriated more than \$20,000,000 last year. Correct, when we include items not included under "Aviation." We appropriated \$12,766,000 more than \$20,000,000 when you add all the items in.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Sure.

Mr. HICKS. And, as I said before, we should have made a comparison, in my judgment, between last year and this year.

Now, what I have in mind is this: In the appropriation of last year of \$20,000,000 under the head of "Aviation" we included new construction at stations, new machines, and it included maintenance of stations. This year for the items which this committee brings forth they appropriated \$7,000,000, not including new aircraft and new construction, which is the comparison with \$20,000,000 of last year.

The construction for aeroplanes and new construction at stations amounts, according to my estimates, to \$8,000,000. So that, to be fair and take what the gentleman has in this bill and what I hope will be put on this bill, it will come to over \$15,000,000, as against \$20,000,000 last year, and I challenge the gentleman to say whether or not that is correct.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HICKS. Yes; for a question.

Mr. MADDEN. I will preface it by what the gentleman said. The gentleman said the gentleman from Michigan had to take a currycomb and go through the departments in order to accumulate the items that make up the \$23,000,000 which he says are appropriated for in this bill. If the currycomb did disclose the items in the aggregate that are embraced in the \$23,000,000, is it not a fair statement to say \$23,000,000 should be appropriated?

Mr. HICKS. Yes; when you add to it \$8,000,000 for new work. The only thing I can say is that it was not quite a fair comparison, because it was put under different headings, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] realizes. And here is what the gentleman from Michigan says shall stand for aviation. He is correct. I do not deny these figures. But it is not the same heading it was under last year, and the public will think we have increased aviation when, as a matter of fact, we have cut it down.

Mr. MADDEN. What has the heading got to do with it?

Mr. HICKS. Here are the items:

Pay of civilians; pay of enlisted men; the subsistence of the enlisted men.

Of course, that is a proper charge against aviation. I do not deny that; but it never has been carried before as a charge against aviation. Last year we appropriated \$20,000,000, which, if we are to include pay and subsistence, would run the total to \$32,766,000. If to this bill carrying \$7,000,000 we are to add \$8,000,000 for new work and the pay and subsistence, the total would be \$32,519,000. But in this bill alone I submit the total under head of aviation and under other heads total \$23,655,000. So if the House denies the inclusion of the item for \$8,000,000 for new work which I will offer as an amendment, aviation next year will receive only \$23,655,000 as against \$32,766,000 this year. I think that is correct.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Is there any allegation anywhere that I included anything for new construction?

Mr. HICKS. Not the slightest; that is where the trouble comes in.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What is the fault, then?

Mr. HICKS. That it is not a fair comparison with the bill of last year, because it looks now as if we appropriated by this bill \$23,000,000 as against \$20,000,000 when the \$23,000,000 includes items not included in the \$20,000,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Not at all. The gentleman will find, on page 7 of the report, the comparative table in which it shows that we now carry under this head \$20,000,000 and under this item for 1922, \$6,913,431. Of course, there is nothing now for new construction, which the Committee on Appropriations—

Mr. HICKS. Has no jurisdiction over, perhaps.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That may be.

Mr. HICKS. It is the comparison that I do not think is fair to aviation; that is all. It seems to me in this matter of aviation we should be fair with one of the great branches of the service.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. I decline to yield further for the time being.

I know the gentleman from Michigan is interested in aviation, as I am interested in it. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if this Congress desires to have aviation take the place that it is entitled to as a great arm of the service, they should be willing to have included in this bill an amendment, which comes from the Naval Affairs Committee by unanimous report, asking for an appropriation of over \$5,000,000 for new aircraft and for nearly \$3,000,000 for new structures at our various air stations.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. Just for a question.

Mr. MONDELL. Does not the gentleman think that the gentleman from Michigan has performed a splendid service to the public in setting out in his report exactly what aviation is to cost in the naval bill, rather than camouflaging it, as the committee has done in the past?

Mr. HICKS. I do; he always does. If he had done it for every other branch of the service; but he has not done it for every branch of the service, I think. He has not put into construction the items of pay for officers in the department of construction and repair.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman take the position that because we have appropriated more than we ought to have for aviation in the past we should continue to carry those appropriations?

Mr. HICKS. The gentleman says we have appropriated more for aviation than we need. Why, Mr. Chairman, that is pure nonsense, and I deny it most emphatically. We have not appropriated more for aviation than aviation needs. The one great arm of the service to-day, in my opinion, the world over, is aviation, as recognized by Japan, by Great Britain, by France, and by Italy. So far as I am personally concerned, I would rather see less money put in these great \$45,000,000 battleships and battle cruisers after the 1916 program is completed and more put into airplane carriers and into aircraft of various kinds, because I believe that the time will come—it may be dawning now—when the Air Service of this country will be the most important service in the military arm of the Government.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman vote to cut down the appropriations for the construction of dreadnaughts?

Mr. HICKS. Not in the present program. Will the gentleman from Wyoming do it?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman just stated he would prefer to spend it for aircraft rather than for battleships.

Mr. HICKS. In the future.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, at some other time.

Mr. HICKS. Now that we have the 1916 program authorized, and the money already appropriated for it in large part and most of the ships underway, I believe that that program should be carried to completion without change.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman from New York know that we are spending this year for aircraft and air service in the United States, under the various services, almost as much as we paid for all of our Military Establishment before the beginning of the war?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If there is such juggling with this bill by the gentleman's colleagues as he would indicate, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York what chance have we Democrats and the country to expect good legislation? [Laughter.]

Mr. HICKS. I will let the gentleman from Wyoming answer that. It is too deep for me.

Mr. Chairman, there is one great need, it seems to me, for aviation at the present time, and that is in the shape of airplane carriers. I do not imagine that Congress will care to appropriate \$28,000,000 for an airplane carrier this year, for that is about what these airplane carriers cost at the present time. Our Bureau of Construction and Repair has such a ship under advisement, a ship with a speed of 33 knots, 850 feet in length, with a capacity of 80 planes, at a cost of \$28,000,000. I think the experts, both Navy and Army experts, are of the opinion that the strongest fighting force that our Navy can put forth is in the shape of airplane carriers, which will carry the projectile, not 20 miles, as will a 16-inch gun, but carry it 200 miles in the shape of an airplane equipped with bombs and torpedoes. We are perfecting to-day torpedoes to be carried by airplanes. When these are projected from the airplane carriers you are able to carry your explosives 200 miles, and even 500 miles, away from your ship. It seems to me the time is going to come, and come soon, when this Congress must appropriate sums of money for these airplane carriers in order to keep our fleet abreast of the times.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I noticed in the press the other day the statement that an arrangement had been made for a test between an airplane and a ship. Can the gentleman give us any information as to a test of that kind?

Mr. HICKS. I will say to the gentleman—and the question is a live one—there have been tests made on the old *Indiana* by airplanes. Of course the gentleman knows that the *Indiana* was built 20 years ago, and a bomb that would blow the *Indiana* to pieces might not blow the new *California* to pieces. Therefore the test is not conclusive. The fact that we could hit the *Indiana* or not hit her would not be conclusive either, for we are improving our sights and equipment, and a miss to-day might be a hit to-morrow.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I understood that we were to use a ship which was formerly connected with the German Navy.

Mr. HICKS. That is the plan, to use a German vessel. The gentleman from Oklahoma realizes this further fact. We might take out a ship for target practice and not be able to hit that ship, but that does not mean that a year from now, with modern sighting devices, we could not be able to hit the target five times out of ten. Everything is in process of evolution. Aviation is in its infancy. We are going forward, and I believe the time will come when we will be able to strike battleships from a height of 4,000 or 5,000 feet in the air with bombs with reliable accuracy. That is guesswork. We may and we may not be able to do it. The same with torpedoes. They may be crude now, but American genius will perfect them, and they may and probably will be launched from planes with deadly effect.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] knows that my remarks about his report were made in entire good nature, and I merely brought this to the attention of the committee because perhaps the comparison might not be understood.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman will state to the House that every sentence in the report is true.

Mr. HICKS. The figures are correct, as I have stated before.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And the statements are correct.

Mr. HICKS. The statements are correct, but the comparison it seemed to me was not quite fair to aviation; that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hicks] has expired.

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PELL] eight minutes.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the appropriation by the Government at this time of an enormous sum of money for any purpose requires for its justification careful

thought and a clear demonstration of its necessity. The question before us is one of insurance. We must first appraise the forces we now have and also the possible risks we may run. Our naval policy should be considered in relation to the policies of other countries with which we may come into collision. It is quite true that a warship becomes obsolete after a time, but the same thing can be said of an insurance policy, and I have never heard this argument used to oppose the insuring of a house against fire or an automobile against the results of an accident.

At the present moment, without building another ship, we have a fleet strong enough to hold absolute control of the Pacific. If we feel seriously that in the future the only possible danger to this country lies on its western shore, it would clearly be the part of good sense to concentrate our fleet there and to establish enormous naval bases in the Pacific. If we think that there is no possible menace in the Atlantic, there can be no need of an Atlantic Fleet. A few gunboats and, perhaps, to protect landings, a couple of ships carrying heavy cannon would be ample for any needs that we may have in Central America or the West India Islands. Therefore the justification of the existence of an Atlantic Fleet, if there be any justification at all for its existence, must be sought among the great naval powers of Europe. We should consider carefully their economic and naval policy.

During the administrations of McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft the United States Navy, from having been a poor second to England, became a poor third to England and Germany, but conditions were such in Europe during that time that our policy was perfectly justified. It would have been impossible at any time between 1900 and 1914 for the English to have detached enough ships to contain the Navy of the United States without having the Germans on their backs, and if the collision had come with Germany the last German ship would have scarcely been through the channel before the English would have attacked them in the rear. This hostile balance no longer exists in Europe. British squadrons could very easily keep every warship in Europe blockaded in harbor. The United States fleet at the present moment would be able to do the same thing to any European combination in which England had no part. Our problem now narrows down to the possibility of a contest with England, and it is this thorny problem which I propose to take up.

Since the dawn of history the most important wars fought to the death between great powers have been the struggles for the control of the sea. This has been true from the days when that control meant the Athenian hegemony of the Aegean till to-day, when it means the British domination of all salt water. No country has ever achieved the command of the sea without a battle, and the commercial and the armed control of the oceans of the world have always gone hand in hand.

We need not look for any great friendship from Europe in the near future. There will not be a merchant from England or the Continent doing business in any quarter of the world who will not find as he tries to revive his business, interrupted by the war, an American rival established within the last few years. Europe will be poor; we will be rich. Europe will be more heavily ground down by the taxgatherer than we. At every point of international contact we will have an advantage which will be bitterly resented by the business man we are trying to supplant. He will feel that for three long years he fought our battles, while we reaped a profit from his agony, and that even now, and for the next 30 years, the European merchant will be taxed to pay interest on the debt incurred in the common cause by their nations to the United States.

For a long time to come the most difficult thing that a European politician will have to explain to his constituents and the most fruitful source of European discontent will be the enormously high tax rate. The party in power will tell the people that though they have practiced almost unheard of economies, it is impossible to save the rich from being impoverished and the poor from being ground to powder because of the extortionate demands of the Americans, who are requiring the uttermost farthing of their debt. We will be held up to execration by these politicians as a people which enriched itself during the beginning of the war and then demanded the last drop of blood for our belated assistance.

The guiding policy of England since the dynastic wars under the Plantagenet kings has been the development of its commercial power. From the reign of Henry VII until half way through that of Elizabeth this policy inspired the attempt to take the control of the seas from Spain. Since the destruction of the Spanish armada the policy of England has been to beat down the attempts of other nations to expand their commerce at the

expense of Great Britain. There is no reason to think that this policy will change in the future merely because the rising commercial power will be the English-speaking United States rather than Spain, Holland, France, or Germany.

I have received a report of a subcommittee appointed by a standing committee of the British Parliament on the subject of the increasing share the American meat producers are taking in the markets of Europe. Of course, this only applies to one industry, but the general policy would probably be the same in any other case.

This report says, paragraph 7:

The companies were joint contractors of the allied forces—

And, paragraph 8:

No complaint was made to us of unfair trading on the part of the American companies, except that in "developing" trade or in clearing surplus stocks they would make no limit in cutting prices. Most of the witnesses praised them for their enterprise in placing cheap meat of good quality before the public and for giving good service to their customers.

Paragraph 9:

We understand that American companies have been making inquiries into the possibilities of developing a packing-house business in the Irish meat trade. If these projects are successful, their progress will have to be very carefully watched.

The report refers to the increase in the percentage of trade that the Americans have taken with fear, not only of the skill of the American companies, but with concern lest (paragraph 13), "the immense financial strength of the American companies by itself forces the British companies into a position of inferiority." It continues (paragraph 14), "We found through all branches of the meat trade a general apprehension that the American meat companies were aiming at world dominion. Fears as to the extension of their activities are not confined to this country—England—but are equally strong in Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. Without necessarily indorsing all the fears that have been expressed, we—the committee of Parliament—do concur in the opinion of the home trade, that it is not a healthy condition of affairs when, in 1913, the American companies controlled over 45 per cent of the supply of all beef, home raised and imported, at Smithfield market, and the danger is not lessened by the fact that the strength of the American companies depends more on their wealth and business ability than on any conjoint action in this country." (Paragraph 16) "In fact, if foreign interests were convinced that His Majesty's Government were resolved that the share of the beef trade which is at present in foreign hands should not be increased to the loss of the producers at home and in the Dominions and of British importing companies, they would not be disposed to incur the heavy losses which aggressive action on their part would entail, and the risk of aggression would disappear." This committee contends that the English Government should exercise some control over shipping which (paragraph 16) "is virtually a monopoly of British ship owners," in order to prevent foreign trade from expanding. They also recommend that the Las Palmas works (paragraph 17), "which since the autumn of 1915 have been operated on behalf of His Majesty's Government, should continue to be run on the same lines. The possession of the Las Palmas works gives the British—Government an observation post of great value in the very center of the operations of the American meat companies, and we—the committee—are confident that its utility will be no less in peace time than it was during the war." (Paragraph 18) "It is proposed to stimulate production by granting a bounty; in this way it was expected that foreign companies would be at a permanent disadvantage and would be unable to increase their trade." (Paragraph 20) "Of necessity, we have had to confine our investigations to the meat trade of the United Kingdom, but so far as there is danger from large combinations, other countries, both consuming and producing countries, are likely to suffer as much as our own."

It is very clear from this report that the English Government has no intention of resigning the position Great Britain has held for so many generations. It would be unfair for us to complain of this decision of a foreign nation. In their place, we would do the same thing. If any of us were members of the British House of Commons, we would unquestionably vote for the policy recommended by this committee; but we are on the other side of the fence. As I do not blame an Englishman for upholding the interests of the British Empire, so as a Member of the American Congress I feel that it is my duty to support the interests of the United States.

Our relations with Europe contain all the raw material which goes to make up difficulties. England at the head of a coalition eventually destroyed the maritime power of Spain and seized for itself the commercial control of the world. When

this supremacy was challenged by France under Louis XIV and Louis XV and under Napoleon, other coalitions led by England were raised up to defend it in the name of Protestantism, the balance of power, legitimacy, democracy, or what not.

It is quite true, of course, that these wars have all been started by the acts of the challenging country, but the same thing has been true from the beginning of history. It was true of the wars between the Greeks and the Persians, the wars between the Romans and the Carthaginians, and in the countless other cases in which the challenger has been beaten. We need not delude ourselves. If we intend to succeed Germany as the chief commercial competitor of Great Britain, we will succeed also to Germany's position as the chief enemy of England; but there are circumstances to-day which for the first time in history may make war not an ineluctable necessity. The conditions of the present make it almost certain that a firm policy of naval expansion on the part of the United States will give us the maritime control of the world without a struggle. We can build now when England can not, and, once in possession of that control, our commerce may develop in peace and the United States can be for centuries to come what England has been for centuries past—the dominant country of the world, in whose strength will lie the ultimate arbitrament of mundane destiny.

Let us not imagine for a moment that all this is not fully realized in London. The English are poor; British exchange is cheaper in America than it has ever been before. New York rather than London is becoming the financial capital of the world. Bitter economies, governmental and private, are the order of the day in England, and yet they are strengthening their navy and their air forces. This they would not do except under pressing necessity, and against whom can they possibly be building? The German fleet is annihilated, and it is inconceivable that the English will ever allow them to build it up again. The rest of Europe is poorer than England, and the combined continental fleets to-day could not stand for an hour against the British. There can be but one possible opponent against whom they are not fully prepared, and that is the United States; and yet, even in their poverty, they stint themselves to prepare against a possible opponent.

I have on other occasions discussed the foregoing of interest by the United States of the debt owed us by England. If this remission were to mean that the money would be used to develop England commercially—in other words, if it were put into the capital of our debtor—there might be a good reason for allowing deferred payments; but it seems to me that as long as the British Empire is able to build war vessels, which would be superfluous against any country except the United States, that it is a poor policy for us not to demand that this debt be paid as it comes due. We should remit nothing to any country which spends a single dollar on the expansion of its naval armament. Any country which is rich enough to build a navy against us is rich enough to pay its debts and should not be allowed to whine of its poverty while it prepares a dagger for our heart.

I am not speaking now with any hostility toward England, and God knows that I do not want to see this country involved in another war, but I feel strongly that the United States, in building a fleet so powerful that it obviously will dominate the sea, can do more to preserve the ultimate peace of the world than it possibly can in any other way.

We have been told that a strong Navy may be a fruitful cause of war. I do not believe that it is only the consciousness of weakness and the certainty of defeat that keeps the United States from embarking on a course of truculent arrogance. I know my countrymen better—they are neither bullies nor cowards.

We will never again have the opportunity that we now have. Some nation must be the strongest. This is a fact we can not avoid. Our choice is whether it will be the United States or another country, and our decision to-day will, in all human probability, settle the matter for generations. The chance of becoming, without a struggle, the most powerful in the world has never before been given to any great nation. I know of no people on earth who can be more safely trusted with this power than my own, and we must never forget that this power must lie somewhere and be the possession and glory of some people.

Our decision on this bill will show whether we believe that the United States is fit to be the first Nation of the world or whether we think that, in the last analysis, we should deliberately take a colonial position and leave the ultimate decision of world affairs to London. Either England or the United States will be the strongest nation of the world. I am for the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PELL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Why do we not stop all this talk about releasing our debtors from the payment of the interest which they owe us? We all of us expect that money to be paid. Every time we mention the possibility of remitting those payments it encourages some people to think we do not expect the money to be paid.

Mr. PELL. The gentleman is quite right. We should see to it that every country which owes us money, and which is able to build ships, is obliged to pay us back every last dollar. [Applause.]

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] five minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, on yesterday I called the attention of the House and the country to the fact that we have pending on the calendar of this House an important piece of legislation that the country has demanded to be acted upon. Time is now of the essence. [Applause.] On the 4th day of March this Congress will end and this work of months and months and years on the packer question, that is now nearing legislation, if we can get a parliamentary status in this House when a vote can be reached, can result in legislation before the 4th day of March. We have a situation in this country where five organizations control the market place and the distributing agency of the great live-stock interests of the Nation. There has been much abuse of power on the part of these five organizations. It has got beyond private business. It has got to the point where these five agencies stand between the producing sections of our Nation and the consuming section of the Nation, and we find this remarkable aspect at this time. Only recently one of these five organizations declared a stock dividend of 1,223 per cent and another is appropriating \$6,000,000 toward building a monument to the ancestors of this concern. Whereas, on the other hand, in the live-stock sections of this Nation ranches are being depopulated, and they are unable to replenish the feeding pens from the Middle West. They are unable to finance themselves in order to get the live stock to the consuming sections. The cattlemen of the Nation and the consuming section of the Nation have made an appeal that there be legislation overlooking the enterprises of these five great concerns. The Senate has passed the bill, the House has reported the bill, and it is on the calendar of the House. We can have legislation in 24 hours. I have shown where the source of power lays on yesterday. We need not expect anything from the steering committee, because it is dominated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madden], from the city of Chicago, the home of the packers; we must appeal to the leader of the majority party of this House [Mr. Monnell], and he has stated to the representatives of the live-stock interests of the country that if the Gronna bill is reported to the House that there are enough votes to pass it. We appeal to him to give us a parliamentary status so that this bill can be passed.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman must not misstate my attitude on this question.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I put the statement in the Record on yesterday.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman can put some one else's statement in the Record, if he desires, but he must not misquote me.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I do not care to misquote the gentleman. I quoted from a signed statement, and that signed statement was put in the Record on yesterday, and the gentleman has not controverted it.

Mr. MONDELL. The signed statement does not worry me a particle.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I hope the gentleman will not take my time, but the gentleman is responsible for not giving us the parliamentary status to get up this legislation [applause], and that ought at least give him some concern or worry.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALSH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15975, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 4825. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River, between the States of Oregon and Washington, at or within 2 miles westerly from Cascade Locks, in the State of Oregon;

S. 4737. An act authorizing the Prescott Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across Lake St. Croix at or near the city of Prescott, in the State of Wisconsin;

S. 4603. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the Gulf Ports Terminal Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Florida, to construct a bridge over and across the headwaters of Mobile Bay and such navigable channels as are between the east side of the bay and Blakely Island, in Baldwin and Mobile Counties, Ala.," approved October 5, 1917;

S. 4787. An act granting consent for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Delaware River from the city of Philadelphia, Pa., to the city of Camden, N. J.;

S. 4515. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the navigable waters of the Newark Bay, in the State of New Jersey;

S. 4541. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at Harrisburg, Pa.;

S. 4951. An act to authorize the building of a bridge across the Wateree River in South Carolina;

S. 4950. An act to authorize the building of a bridge across the Pee Dee River in South Carolina;

S. 4949. An act to authorize the building of a bridge across the Santee River in South Carolina;

S. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the north branch of the Susquehanna River from the city of Wilkes-Barre, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Dorancton, county of Luzerne, Pa.;

S. 4587. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Brooks and Lowndes, in the State of Georgia, to construct a bridge over the Withlacoochee River; and

S. 4886. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation to construct a bridge across the Hudson River, in the State of New York," approved March 13, 1914.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FAIRFIELD for three days on account of important business.

To Mr. MASON until February 12.

To Mr. MORIN, indefinitely, on account of illness in the family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 11, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ESCH, from the Select Committee on Water Power, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15126) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Federal power commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto, and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1314), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VESTAL, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15767) to authorize the coinage of a 50-cent piece in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Missouri into the Union, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1315), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HULL of Iowa, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15874) authorizing the city of New Orleans, La., to extend Dauphine Street in said city across the United States military reservation known as the Jackson Barracks, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1316), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CRAGO, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14922) for the relief of Mary Neaf, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1317), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 16071) to prohibit the payment of gratuities to the masters of vessels, or other persons, for the purpose of inducing or securing contracts for repairing vessels or furnishing vessels with supplies or other necessities; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 16072) to amend an act entitled "An act to give indemnity for damages caused by American forces abroad," approved April 18, 1918; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Resolution (H. Res. 678) requesting the Postmaster General to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 679) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, asking enactment of the King bill providing for surveying of public lands in the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah relating to a proposed Federal reclamation project on Green River in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah asking for increased tariff on lead; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 16073) for the relief of Samuel H. Dolbear; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 16074) granting an increase of pension to Betsey Lahiff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5653. By Mr. BABKA: Petition of P. J. O'Connell and people of the Holy Name Parish, Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the deportation of Mayor O'Callaghan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5654. Also, petition of council of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the immediate recognition of the Irish republic by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5655. Also, petition of Cuyahoga County Council of the American Legion, representing 31 American Legion posts in Ohio, urging the immediate passage of House bill 14961, and the Capper bill (H. R. 4613); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5656. By Mr. BEGG: Petition of members of St. Stephen's Church, St. Stephen, Ohio, protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5657. By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: Petition of certain citizens of York, Pa., protesting against pending legislation affecting the Yellowstone National Park and other national parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

5658. By Mr. CLEARY: Petition of Citizens' Medical Reference Bureau of New York City, in opposition to compulsory medicine and Senate bill 3259; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5659. Also, petition of Young Men's Benevolent Society, Brooklyn, N. Y., and certain citizens in meeting at Parish Hall of the Holy Ghost, Forty-sixth Street and Seventeenth Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5660. Also, petition of Branch 818 of the Ladies' Catholic Benevolent Association of Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5661. By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of Esther Murray and others of St. Mary's rectory, Elgin, Ill., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5662. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of the Donald T. Shenton Pest, No. 130, American Legion, Philadelphia, Pa., urging passage of the Rogers bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5663. Also, petition of the Poor Richard Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the daylight-saving legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5664. Also, petition of the New Century Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the passage of the Esch-Jones bill (H. R. 14469); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5665. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of D. O. Thompson, secretary of the Illinois Agricultural Association, favoring the passage of the bill to regulate the packing industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5666. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Submarine Signal Co. and Commonwealth Trust Co., both of Boston, Mass., urging the passage of the Nolan bill (H. R. 15662); to the Committee on Patents.

5667. Also, petition of Ladies' Catholic Benevolent Association, Alice C. Maloney, Massachusetts supreme trustee, representing 10,000 members in Massachusetts, and petition of Liberty St. Alphonsus Association, of Boston, Frank V. Ward, president, all in the State of Massachusetts, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5668. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of Young Men's Catholic Society of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5669. By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of V. C. Squier Co., of Battle Creek, Mich., protesting against the free entry of wound musical strings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5670. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of Daughters of Isabella of Court Mary Elizabeth No. 256, Lake Placid, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5671. Also, petition of sundry citizens of St. Regis Falls, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5672. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the town of West Chazy, N. Y., opposing the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5673. By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Commodore Perry Council No. 14, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wakefield, R. I., protesting against the admission into this country of undesirable and illiterate immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5674. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of certain citizens and voters of Defiance County, Ohio, protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 11, 1921.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 2, 1921.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

CREDENTIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a certificate of the governor of Nevada certifying to the election of TASKER L. ODDIE as a Senator from that State for the term of six years, beginning March 4, 1921, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF NEVADA,
Executive Department.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that at a general election held in the State of Nevada on Tuesday, the 2d day of November, 1920, TASKER L. ODDIE was duly elected by the qualified electors of the State of Nevada a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1921, having received the highest number of votes cast for said office at said election, as appears by the certificate of the duly constituted and qualified board of canvassers now on file in the office of the secretary of state at Carson City, Nev.

Witness: His excellency our governor, Emmet D. Boyle, and our seal hereto affixed at Carson City this 21st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1920.

EMMET D. BOYLE, Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

GEORGE BRODIGAN, Secretary of State.
By R. P. BURRIS, Deputy.

CUSTOMS STAMPS (S. DOC. NO. 383).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, suggesting a paragraph of legislation for inclusion in the pending deficiency bill increasing the number of sheets of customs stamps to be delivered by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing during the current fiscal year, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. H. Overhue, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 4515. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the navigable waters of the Newark Bay, in the State of New Jersey;

S. 4541. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at Harrisburg, Pa.;

S. 4587. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Brooks and Lowndes, in the State of Georgia, to construct a bridge over the Withlacoochee River;

S. 4603. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the Gulf Ports Terminal Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Florida, to construct a bridge over and across the headwaters of Mobile Bay and such navigable channels as are between the east side of the bay and Blakely Island, in Baldwin and Mobile Counties, Ala.," approved October 5, 1917;

S. 4737. An act authorizing the Prescott Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across Lake St. Croix at or near the city of Prescott, in the State of Wisconsin;

S. 4787. An act granting consent for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Delaware River from the city of Philadelphia, Pa., to the city of Camden, N. J.;

S. 4825. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River between the States of Oregon and Washington at or within 2 miles westerly from Cascade Locks, in the State of Oregon;

S. 4896. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation to construct a bridge across the Hudson River, in the State of New York," approved March 13, 1914;

S. 4949. An act to authorize the building of a bridge across the Santee River in South Carolina;

S. 4950. An act to authorize the building of a bridge across the Pee Dee River in South Carolina;

S. 4951. An act to authorize the building of a bridge across the Wateree River in South Carolina; and

S. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the north branch of the Susquehanna River from the city of Wilkes-Barre, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Dorranceton, county of Luzerne, Pa.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MOSES presented resolutions of Villa Marcia, Association Canado-Americaine, and Cour Les Montagnards, Association Canado-Americaine, both of Claremont, N. H., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PAGE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chester and Delaware Counties, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to reduce armaments, and also favoring a naval holiday, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BALL presented memorials of Kate Dougherty, Rosalie F. Pool, Paul Dougherty, C. W. Zolper, Z. A. Pool, James A. Harty, Frank J. Harty, Mae A. Hughes, Ellen V. O'Dwyer, Lucy Peach, Helen Gleeson, Pauline E. Piebling, Nan A. Neary, Cecilia M. Hamill, and William J. Reader, jr., all of Wilmington, Del., and sundry citizens of Milford, Del., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented memorials of Marion Dougherty, George R. Dougherty, and John J. Dougherty, all of Wilmington, Del., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.